DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 068 UD 026 070

TITLE	Partnerships in Education.
INSTITUTION	Hawaii Univ., Manoa. Coll. of Education.
REPORT NO	ISSN-0013-1849
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	43p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Educational Perspectives; v27 n1 Sum 1990
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Networks; *School Business Relationship; *School Restructuring; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

This theme issue includes eight articles that discuss partnerships between schools, colleges, and businesses. The partnerships are members of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). "School-University Partnerships: Fundamental Concepts" (J. I. Goodlad) outlines the concepts, agenda, and structure essential to school-university partnerships. "School-University Partnerships: Collaborative Effort for School Renewal and the Education of Educators" (J. M. Chang and J. P. Dolly) describes the Hawaii School/University Partnership, which focuses on school success, teacher preservice education, and principal preparation. "New Partnerships for the Education of Educators" (R. W. Clark) describes an evolving school-university partnership-based teacher education program. "Collaboration and Inquiry: Guiding Principles of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal" (C. Wilson) describes the design of underlying partnerships between Colorado schools and teacher education programs. "Beyond Compliance: The Obligations of Leadership" (R. Andrews) describes a strategy for successful school leadership based on vision, communication, positioning, and self-management. "Partners in Learning and Leading" (N. Austin and L. Miller) outlines the lessons learned by a working group of teachers and university faculty. "Self-Interests in School/Business Partnerships" (B. L. Jones and R. W. Maloy) argues that partnership activities lead to the development of more independently professional roles for all workers in more equitable organizational structures. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 328068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alex Kwok

Univ. of Hawaii

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 028 070

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education/University of Hawai'i at Manoa

John P Dolly, Dean

EDITORIAL BOARD
Executive Editor Alexander L Pickens
Editor Alexander P Kali
Associate Editors Daniel Fullmer, Arthur King, Gisela Speidel and Ralph Stueber
Business Manager Kalvin Kashimoto

ADVISORY BOARD
Lawrence Bremmer *U of Washington*
August Freundlich *U of South Florida*
Maxine Greene *Columbia University*
Richard Kraft *U of Colorado at Boulder*

The Journal and the College of Education assume no responsibility for the opinions or facts in signed articles, except to the extent of expressing the view, by the fact of publication, that the subject matter is one which merits attention.

Published twice each year by the College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Subscription Rate: $5 per year; individual copies $3.

Address all communications regarding single copies, subscriptions, manuscripts, and correspondence about editorial material to Executive Editor, *Educational Perspectives*, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Wist Annex 2, Room 228, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu HI 96822.

Copyright 1989 by the College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

This publication is available in microform from Xerox University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106; Xerox University Microfilms,35 Mobile Drive, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4A 1H6; and University Microfilms, St. John's Road, Tyler's Green, Penn, Buckinghamshire, England.

International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) 0013-1849.

CONTENTS

2 **School-University Partnerships: Fundamental Concepts**
John I Goodlad

7 **School-University Partnerships: Collaborative Effort for School Renewal and the Education of Educators**
Juvenna M Chang & John P Dolly

11 **New Partnerships for the Education of Educators**
Richard W Clark

17 **Collaboration and Inquiry: Guiding Principles of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal**
Carol Wilson

22 **"Restructuring" vs "School Improvement"**
Paul E Heckman

27 **Beyond Compliance: The Obligations of Leadership**
Richard Andrews

31 **Partners in Learning and Leading**
Nancy Austin & Lynne Miller

35 **Self-Interests in School/Business Partnerships**
Byrd L Jones & Robert W Maloy

Partnerships in Education

Volume 27, Number 1, Summer 1990

School-University Partnerships: Fundamental Concepts

John I Goodlad

The National Network for Educational Renewal is designed to bring into close collaboration a number of school-university partnerships, each formed for the purpose of simultaneously improving schools and the education of educators. These partnerships, in turn, have been established because of a shared belief that nothing short of fundamental renewal of educational programs for both children and youth, on one hand, and those who teach in and administer schools, on the other, is now required. Merely adding or subtracting a few things, tightening up here and there and patching the weak spots in the educational system will not suffice.

Nonetheless, there is little in the history of educational improvement to suggest that more than changes around the edges is possible. Recent major studies of schooling have identified problems of the curriculum, of pedagogy, persisting over the years and changing only in the specifics of their manifestations. Similarly, dozens of reports testify to the intransigence of critical problems pertaining to the education of educators. One is forced to ask the question regarding the shortfall between our ideal expectations for education and what the system delivers: Do the problems and shortcomings prevail because too many people are served so well by keeping things the way they are?

There is little in the history of school-university relations to suggest that collaboration has served to solve tough, persistent problems. Often, the relationship has been self-serving, bypassing areas of *mutual* self-interest calling for give-and-take and joint inquiry. Schools, for example, have sought university-based consultants to help them do better what they already do. Universities have sought out teachers in schools to supervise their student teachers, and these "cooperating teachers" have passed along the conventional wisdom to their future colleagues. Neither the schools nor the teacher education programs have been fundamentally changed in the process. Yet, the criticism of both seldom has been more intense. It is hard not to conclude that more than tinkering is necessary.

Consequently, over a dozen universities have entered into long-term agreements with surrounding school districts (and their schools) to work closely together with one another *as equal partners* for purposes of addressing long-standing, tough problem areas in which both sets of institutions have a stake. Recognizing the difficulties and complexities of working together on overlapping self-interests, which in themselves are complex, the institutions have made substantial commitments to the partnership of which they are a part. Some of these commitments are spelled out on subsequent pages. Recognizing that networking has proven to be a useful strategy for strengthening local, collaborating entities, each school-university partnership has joined in the National Network for Educational Renewal. Again, a serious commitment is involved, the minimum essentials of which are detailed subsequently.

Before proceeding with further elaboration on both these partnerships and the network joining them, it is essential to emphasize a fact that has been largely overlooked in the current rhetoric of educational reform. It is true that many of the most serious problems of schooling and many of the most persistent problems inherent in preparing educators for the schools have been around for a long time. Reform movements have come and gone, leaving very little mark on them. But what has changed — and is changing rapidly — is the context within which institutionalized forms of education function.

Not only have the coalitions that created and sustained the educational system withered, but the institutions comprising a significant part of these coalitions have weakened significantly. The family rivals the school in its loss of stability. Home, school, and religious institution no longer join as they once did in rearing the young. Further, a secondary school that once enrolled only a fraction of the age group — and those young people most supported by other institutions in the coalition — has become part of the common school. The problems of dealing with student diversity grow ever greater. Perhaps most serious of all,

the parental and solid-citizen role models of an intimate community and the heroes of virtue of earlier times have been largely replaced by the glamorized lives of "beautiful people" and athletes whose exploits are made exotic and larger than life by attentive media. The role of education in enculturation is threatened by serious imperfections in the culture itself.

One major implication of all this, and more, is that we must look beneath the often-cited problems of low test scores, for example, in seeking an agenda worth the time and energy of the teachers, principals, professors, superintendents, and deans, embraced by a school-university partnership. Another is that the changing context briefly sketched above will not become more amenable to educational processes — especially the moral imperatives embedded in such processes — unless the educative role of other institutions is maximized. Although this document focuses on the minimum essentials of a healthy school-university relationship, it is assumed that each partnership will join with other agencies committed to the ideal of educative communities. The drug problem, for instance, will not be solved by school-based classes, counseling, and student searches, however useful these may be. If it is to be resolved at all, the solutions will come from recognizing and addressing this problem and others attributed to schools as clear signs of pathology in home and community and, indeed, the larger society.

Some Assumptions

It is assumed that the partnerships entered into are symbiotic in nature — that is, two different kinds of organisms (institutions) are joining for the joint satisfaction of mutual self-interests. The obvious differences between schools and universities, which undeniably complicate and frustrate collaborations, are strengths, not weaknesses to be overcome. Without them, collaborations would represent redundancy. Nonetheless, there are overlapping self-interests (schools need better teachers; universities need better sites in which to prepare future teachers). The agenda of collaboration grows out of the points of overlap. For a partnership to be successful, each partner must see satisfaction of the self-interests of the other(s) as essential to the satisfaction of its own. Consequently, to see to it that the self-interests of the other(s) are met is to be both self-less and self-serving. It is realistic, not cynical, to suggest that partnerships lacking this balance of selflessness and selfishness are short-lived.

It is assumed that each partnership is to be characterized by efficient and effective sharing of information and knowledge, either produced by its members or coming from other sources. Schools and universities in collaboration for the improvement of schooling and education must maintain a commitment to quality information and knowledge *in context* — that is, in terms of relevant historical, current, and projected social, political, and economic circumstances and conditions at local, state, national, and international levels. Consequently, the results of both previous research and new research (including formative evaluation) will infuse ongoing processes of renewal.

It is assumed that each partnership will seek to clarify and promulgate a small set of beliefs about what education is and what this conception means for priorities, programs, and practices. This set must be small enough to maximize near-consensus of endorsement, and yet permit maximum flexibility for local initiative and creative response. Leaders, therefore, must be willing and able to empower others with the time and autonomy necessary for individual creativity. For example, it is assumed that each partnership is committed to assuring equal access to knowledge for all students. But what blocks access and, therefore, what must be done to remove the blocks differs from institution to institution.

It is assumed that individual schools and individual preparation programs are the centers of improvement efforts. Research shows that change does not come about and is not sustained through intervention and installation techniques. Rather, persons in schools and responsible for programs must learn how to effect improvement as a built-in characteristic. They take care of their business in increasingly better ways. Therefore, resources and time are essential to a renewal process that involves dialogue, decision making, action taking, and evaluation. Unless the conditions for renewal marked by inquiry are created, improvement once more will be at the edges, not fundamental.

The paths to truly effective partnerships between schools or school districts and universities are not at all clear. Indeed, a preliminary review of the literature suggests that symbiotic partnerships, as defined above, have scarcely been attempted. It is assumed, then, that there is much to be learned by everyone involved. Consequently, "staff development," as inservice education has come to be called, is for everyone, not just those at the base of the organizational pyramid — superintendents, deans, and professors, as well as teachers and principals.

Efforts to attribute accountability signal pathology in the system. Consequently, it is assumed that the partnership entered into will eschew in their operations any search for persons or places for the affixing of blame. Instead, every effort will be made to develop values and

practices that promote a system of shared responsibilities. Clearly, the largest source of power and energy for educational improvement is at the base of the organizational pyramid referred to above. We see once again the enlightened role of leadership in empowering teachers and principals in schools and those who have responsibility for teacher education and other preparation programs so that the process of change becomes one of continual renewal.

The cards are stacked against improvement that is anything other than glacial or cosmetic. Policy makers frequently berate educators for their apparent inertia and then often enact mandates that encourage intertia. It is assumed that the current opportunity to restructure schooling and the education of educators will pass us by unless the policies enacted (and not enacted) succeed in both unleashing the energy of educators and then providing the infrastructure by means of which this energy will be constructively guided and supported. In some cases, this means rolling back state legislature already on the books. In some instances, it means providing the financial resources for local planning and action. Consequently, the partnerships cannot afford to remain mute with respect to the larger educational context of which they are a part. Some of them represent up to 30 percent of the student enrollment in the state. It becomes obvious that partnerships can and must play a significant role in the advocacy of policy to support sound educational practices. Likewise, the National Network for Educational Renewal assumes such advocacy as one of its major functions.

School-University Partnerships: Minimum Essentials

Concept. A school-university partnership represents a planned effort to establish a formal, mutually beneficial inter-institutional relationship characterized by the following:

- Sufficient dissimilarity among institutions to warrant the effort of seeking complementarity in the fulfillment of some functions.
- Sufficient overlap in some functions to make clearly apparent the potential benefits of collaboration.
- Sufficient commitment to the effective fulfillment of these overlapping functions to warrant the inevitable loss of some present control and authority on the part of the institution currently claiming dominant interest.

Purposes. The intent is to create a process and an accompanying structure through which each *equal* party to a collaborative agreement will seek to draw on the complementary strengths of the other *equal* parties in advancing its self-interests. Each partnership is a means to this end — and not an end in itself.

The central purposes are three:

- The exemplary performance by universities of their educational responsibility to those seeking to become educators or to enhance their present performance as educators. (Increasing the usefulness of the university research function is a major part of this responsibility.)
- The exemplary performance by schools of their educational function and the accompanying exemplary performance of school districts in providing the necessary support.
- The exemplary performance of both universities and schools (and their school districts) in collaborative arrangements and processes that promote both of the above purposes.

Agenda. The agenda grows out of fulfillment of the above purposes. It must not be allowed to grow out of preoccupation with sustaining a partnership for its own sake. Nor is the partnership to be the vehicle for solving all of the problems of schools or all of the problems of preparing educators for the schools. Rather, the partnership is to be used as a device for bringing together institutions that need each other for the solution of tough problems.

The agenda grows out of mutual institutional sensitivity to those problems that have largely resisted previous attempts to resolve them, whether mounted by single institutions or institutions in unison. The specifics will change but the following emerge as hard-rock problems worthy of concerted attention and action:

- The creation of exemplary sites in which future teachers are educated that demonstrate the best we know about how schools should function.
- The creation of internships and residencies for educational specialists (including administrators) through which these professionals may observe and gain experience with the best possible educational practices.
- The development of curriculum that truly reflect the best analyses and projections of what young people need.
- The assurance of equal access of students to these curricula.
- The cultivation of site-based staff development activities

designed to foster continual school renewal, particularly of the curriculum and accompanying pedagogical practices.

- The restructuring of schools to assure increased continuity in student's programs, decreased accumulation of partial and inadequate or misdirected learnings, decreased alienation of students, and more effective utilization of varied teaching resources, including technology.
- The continuous infusion of knowledge relative to provision of good education in schools and in programs preparing educators.
- The creation and utilization of opportunities to promote in the community a continuing informed dialogue about what education is and why it has more to do with the welfare of both individuals and society — than the preparation for jobs.

Structure. Although there probably is no best way to organize school-university partnerships, experience and careful thought suggest at least these minimum essentials (or their equivalents) for structuring each partnership:

- A governing board composed minimally of the superintendent of each collaborating school district and the dean(s) of the participating school(s) or college(s) of education.
- A modest secretariat composed of an executive director reporting to the governing board, and charged with performing both leadership and management functions; and necessary support services provided by a secretary, and desirably, a research assistant — all paid from the partnership budget.
- An operating budget providing both money and specifically assigned personnel from participating institutions. (N.B.: Should any institution volunteer to provide for the executive director, for example, it must be clearly understood that this person reports directly to the governing board in performing partnership functions, not to the institution contributing this resource.)
- Top-level endorsement and support from the cooperating university's chief executive officer and, ultimately, university involvement beyond the school or college of education.
- An orderly process within each partnership of authorizing and monitoring all projects and activities undertaken in the partnership so as to assure widespread understanding and a minimum of bureaucratic procedures and control.
- An ongoing effort to document, analyze, and communicate successes and failures and possible reasons for success and failures (preferably through designating and supporting an individual to take the lead in assuring that the gathering of relevant data is built into the functioning of the partnership.
- The establishment and maintenance of connecting linkages with the National Network for purposes of giving help to and receiving help from other partnerships in the Network.
- A deliberate effort to secure additional funds from external funding sources (particularly those in the state or region).
- The redirection of existing funds within and across institutions for purposes of securing the time necessary for educational renewal.
- A formal time commitment of at least five years.
- Arrangements for sharing information, ideas, and even resources within and across partnerships, including the sharing of responsibility for advocating the best in educational policy and practice.

National Network: Minimum Essentials

In the same vein, a set of minimum essentials is proposed for a network of school-university partnerships focusing on educational renewal:

- Exchange of ideas, practices, information, and personnel among partnerships.
- Provision of data and analysis of experiences for purposes of contributing to our knowledge about change and improvement.
- Task forces addressing common self-interests.
- A communications network among partnerships.
- Support from the Center for Educational Renewal in the form of consultants, exchange of information (newsletter), organization of task forces, periodic meetings and conferences, networking of expertise, and assistance in securing supplementary funds.
- Use of the totality of the National Network for Educational Renewal in advocating the importance of education, sound educational practices and policies that support renewal, not just periodic efforts to upgrade the delivery system.

Conclusion

At the time of this writing, the National Network for Educational Renewal consists of 14 school-university partnerships in as many states. Not surprisingly, these

Cover photo by Carl Viti

Photo courtesy of College of Education Faculty Senate

About the Cover

The National Network for Educational Renewal currently involves school/university partnerships in fourteen states, including Hawai'i. Working collaboratively as equal partners in addressing educational problems, these partnerships operate on the premise that significant change will not take place unless universities and schools change together.

Committed to formulating and implementing this change, the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, the Hawai'i State Department of Education, and the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate formed the Hawai'i School/University Partnership and joined the NNER in October 1986. Although these institutions had prior working agreements, this Partnership offered the first opportunity to formalize their collaboration as equal partners.

Our cover introduces visually the dynamic leaders of the HS/UP. Standing, *left*, Charles Toguchi, Superintendent, Hawai'i State Department of Education; *right*, Michael Chun, President, Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate; *seated*, John P Dolly, Dean, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

For partnerships to survive — and be so successful that everybody wants to be a part of the process — leadership and management must be constant, consistent and compatible. Such a leader-manager is Juvenna Chang, *left*, Executive Director, Hawai'i School/University Partnership.

partnerships vary in their purposes, activities, and robustness. Most are characterized now by the belief that the collaboration underway is well worth the effort, that the differing cultures of the school and the university can and do work to considerable mutual benefit, that this relationship warrants continued cultivation and that accomplishments to date promise many more in the future. A school-university partnership is not a project; it is a way of life.

John I Goodlad is Professor, College of Education, and Director, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington in Seattle. Receiving his PhD from the University of Chicago, Dr Goodlad also serves as Distinguished Visiting Professor, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, and Director, Laboratory in School and Community Education, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles. In 1975, Goodlad received the First Phi Delta Kappa Award for Meritorious Contributions to Education through Research, Evaluation, and Development. A widely published author, his works include *Access to Knowledge*, College Entrance Examination Board, 1990; *A Place Called School*, McGraw-Hill, 1984; *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching*, Jossey-Bass, 1990; *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases and Concerns*, Teachers College Press, 1988, and *The Ecology of School Renewal*, University of Chicago Press, 1987.

School-University Partnerships: Collaborative Effort for School Renewal and the Education of Educators

Juvenna M Chang and John P Dolly

How do you bring about the simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators? One possible solution is offered by John I Goodlad, a nationally recognized educator and author of a revolutionary book in school reform, called *A Place Called School*. Goodlad believes in bringing schools and universities together in a symbiotic relationship which refers to unlike organisms (or institutions) joined intimately in mutually beneficial relationships. Such a partnership requires three minimum conditions: (1) dissimilarity between or among the partners, (2) mutual satisfaction of self-interests and (3) sufficient selflessness on the part of each member to assure the satisfaction of self-interests on the part of all members. Goodlad identifies that the first of these conditions is clearly present while the others must be created and may require resolve, commitment, planning, creativity, leadership, sacrifice, and endurance.

In 1980 the Southern California partnership was created, followed by the establishment of the Brigham Young University and Puget Sound partnerships in 1984. Eventually the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) was created and currently involves school/university partnerships in 14 states, including Hawai'i. These partnerships enter into long-term agreements to work closely with one another as equal partners for purposes of addressing long-standing, tough problem areas in which both sets of institutions have a stake. Partnerships operate on the premise that significant changes will not take place unless universities and schools change together. The purpose of each partnership is to create a climate of mutual respect and trust so that schools and universities can work together to address the "hard rock" problems which have seemed so intractable in the past.

Hawai'i School/University Partnership

The Hawai'i School/University Partnership (HS/UP) joined the NNER in October, 1986. The three educational institutions committed to this effort are the Hawai'i State Department of Education (DOE), the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (COE-UHM) and the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate (KS/BE). Although these institutions had prior working agreements, HS/UP offered the first opportunity to formalize their collaboration as equal partners.

Hawai'i is unique in that it is the only state that has a statewide unified school district with one state superintendent and a single higher education system where UHM serves as the major university of the state. Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate is the only private school involved in any of the partnerships in the national network. Other distinguishing features include the Islands' multicultural setting, the strong presence of private schools, and the willingness of these educational institutions to experiment.

The common thread which brought members of the Hawai'i Partnership together was the interest in addressing the needs of the educationally disadvantaged student — especially those considered to be at-risk. The DOE is seeking strategies to promote school success and prevent at-risk behaviors for all students. The University has an interest in working with the DOE's school renewal efforts as well as preparing educators for school renewal. In its commitment to address the needs of native Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian students throughout the state, KS/BE is also involved in various efforts to reduce the number of students identified as educationally at-risk.

All of these shared problems — and shared visions — led to the mission of the HS/UP which is to solve collaboratively the major problems related to the education of school-age youth in Hawai'i, giving special attention to the educationally disadvantaged who may include at-risk and/or minority students. The HS/UP also supports the national agenda of the simultaneous renewal of school and the education of educators. Areas to be addressed by the partnership include:

- Programs and teacher training models to address the needs of at-risk and minority children;
- Teacher education and certification;
- School-based staff development programs for instructional improvement;
- Site-level school improvement where both teacher training programs and practices in the schools change simultaneously;
- Improvement and coordination of data collected in solving educational problems;
- Integration of the very best in current knowledge, research and theory, and educational practice; and
- Other areas identified by mutual agreement.

Task Forces

To carry out the mission and goals of the NNER, the HS/UP established four task forces to address issues related to school success strategies for at-risk prevention and mainstreaming, teacher education, principal preparation, and exemplary school sites for the preparation of educators and school renewal.

School Success. The school success task force represents a long-term effort to strengthen the individual school's capacity to meet the special needs of at-risk students. Major features of the project include:

- Support for the school as the unit of change;
- Use of community education as a process of networking to strengthen the coordination of resources to assist project schools in responding more effectively to the at-risk population;
- Application of a "cooperative action research" strategy to improve the delivery of services to the at-risk or potentially at-risk, and
- Integration of elements from a number of established and experimental programs to create a critical mass of mutually supportive program features substantial enough to reduce the at-risk problem.

Several school success strategies are being piloted at schools in the DOE's Windward and Leeward districts of O'ahu. The James B Castle High School, in an effort to reduce the trauma and difficulties students have in making the transition from intermediate to high school, is piloting a program using a "school-within-a-school" concept. This restructured group called the "Gold Core" includes 130 randomly selected freshmen assigned to four teachers. Through this restructuring, teachers are afforded the opportunity to plan and work together as a team to personalize the program for a common core of students. Several innovative and research-based approaches such as heterogeneous grouping of students, cooperative learning techniques, and coordinated curriculum planning are incorporated into the program.

At Kahalu'u Elementary School, an at-risk prevention model has been incorporated as part of the school's guidance program. This model was developed through the cooperative efforts of teachers and staff of the KS/BE Alternative Education Program and Kahalu'u Elementary School. The program is designed to enhance positive self-esteem and build social skills in such areas as teamwork, cooperation, and communication.

A subcommittee of the school success task force was formed to identify strategies especially supportive of those students who may be educationally at-risk. Its purpose is to recommend that these identified elements be incorporated into the current and proposed teacher education programs.

Teacher Pre-Service Education. The College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa is a member of the Holmes Group, a national organization which has committed its efforts to address the professionalization of teaching and is committed to the reform of public education. A committee was given the task to redesign the teacher education program at COE-UHM. The overall purpose of this new teacher education program is to educate teachers for their emerging professional roles as agents of educational renewal in Hawai'i's public schools. The general design of the program is based upon four major principles that recognize the new roles emerging for teachers:

- Professional learning should take place in the context of thinking and acting as a teacher;
- To become independent professionals, students should be actively involved in and responsible for their own learning;
- In learning to work collaboratively in schools, students should learn about teaching in collaboration with one another and with practicing professionals; and
- To develop a thoughtful and self-critical attitude toward professional practice, students should routinely evaluate and be evaluated for their learning and performance (*HS/UP Task Force Report*, 1988).

Highlights of the recommendations include: recruitment and retention of quality candidates, including representation from minority groups; trained mentor teachers; reassessment of current course offerings with recommendations for integrated courses and case studies; a semester internship with compensation; a master of science in teaching degree upon completion of the program, and fulltime participation over a requisite two-year period. In its first year, this program will be piloted with a small cohort of students who meet the admissions criteria for both the graduate school and the program (i.e., baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university, academic background appropriate for the level and subject of proposed certification).

Another effort in teacher education is the Pre-Service Education for Teachers of Minorities (PEToM) project which addresses the continuing need for teachers who are motivated and competent to teach educationally at-risk minority students. This program is a two-year alternative teacher education program developed by COE-UHM and KS/BE to educate elementary school teachers for special competency in teaching educationally at-risk minority students. The main purpose of PEToM is to recruit and train teachers specifically to work at school sites where there is a high enrollment of the target population.

Principal Preparation. A report of recommendations from the task force on leadership preparation for Hawai'i's schools gave impetus to the Cohort Training Program currently being developed for implementation in Fall 1990. Highlights of the proposed master's program include a one-year internship, integrated case studies and seminars, and a collaboration of school-site personnel and university faculty.

Exemplary Sites for the Education of Educators and School Renewal. The fourth task force was established to develop criteria in the selection of exemplary field sites for the preparation of teachers and principals and for school renewal. This task force report advocated change in regards to various aspects of the field experiences for teachers and principals. At least 24 school sites dedicated to professional development are required to meet the needs of the current and proposed programs in Hawai'i's teacher education program.

Growing Pains

As in any new venture, there are growing pains as well as varying degrees of successes. One of the major problems facing partnership activities between school districts and colleges of education and/or universities is the high rate of turnover in administrative personnel within both organizations. As an example, in Hawai'i, only two of the original members of the HS/UP executive board remain. This brings about the concern for continued institutional commitment and resources. Public schools are experiencing a period in their history when turnover will exceed 50 percent of both administrators and teachers. Colleges of education, depending on their location, are also experiencing the same rate of turnover due to a rapid expansion period during the 1960s, followed by a long period of stagnation. This means that both organizations throughout the country will be bringing in new administrators and decision makers — and these people will be coming into partnerships previously established with goals, objectives, and financial commitments. The issue to be addressed by all partnerships is quite simply how do we keep them going and how do we prevent the turnover from having a negative impact on what has already been accomplished? For example, how do we prevent administrator turnover from interfering with mutually agreed upon objectives and goals that are being addressed by partnership task forces and activities.

Another of the problems we have in partnerships is thinking of them as fixed entities or institutions that have lives of their own. When one thinks of a partnership as a fixed entity or organizational structure, then new people coming to the partnership may not give it the same commitment or level of support that the individuals who founded the partnership were willing to invest in terms of time, effort and money. Most administrators want to come to a new role with the option to establish their own priorities and their own objectives — and their own organizational structures to achieve those objectives. Administrators may perceive the partnership as interfering with what they want to accomplish rather than helping to facilitate it. Many partnership activities require commitments of time, effort, and money to achieve goals that may take three to five years to accomplish. This requires a long-term commitment of personnel and financial resources that new administrators may not be willing to commit, particularly when they were not the ones to establish the partnership. The problem is clearly this: Does the superintendent or dean of education want to put a partnership activity as the number one priority when he or she may not get credit for its success but may be forced to accept the blame for its failure?

Partnership As Process

One way to think of a partnership is not as a fixed entity

or organizational structure but simply as a process. If one can think of it as such, then the individuals involved are not tied to a very rigid set of objectives; instead they tie into a set of procedures that encourages interaction, sharing of ideas, and the development of mutual goals that would benefit both organizations. A process allows the new players, both in the schools and the colleges, to establish their initiatives and their own objectives. This makes the partnership much more flexible in addressing *new needs* and *changing priorities* in both organizations. By allowing the new leadership the opportunity to set their own goals and agendas, the partnership as a process can allow individuals to take credit for new programs and the success deriving from new objectives and goals. By maintaining partnerships as a process, it also allows the new leadership to reestablish old goals and makes those goals part of a new partnership agenda that reflect their thinking. Even a simple task such as reworking a statement of objectives and goals to better reflect the current philosophies of those in charge of the partnership can establish ownership in the process.

Current partnerships within the NNER have organized their activities around task forces. These task forces sometimes take on a life of their own and become ongoing, permanent activities. For example, redesigned teacher education programs become regular permanent programs that, in turn, become longterm. Although these programs are experimental in nature, they still require a major commitment from the participating institutions. These may involve developing structures, procedures, and personnel all working toward a common set of goals and objectives.

If one instead thinks of partnerships as a process that enables people with similar concerns and objectives to work together, then the rigidity of the task force notion becomes more fluid and more easily changed, modified, and adopted to new administrators as they come on board. The goal is getting organizations to commit to the process. If organizations are committed to the process of partnerships, then changes in leadership may change priorities and directions but not cooperation and mutual support. This means people can be changed in order to meet process objectives which are not tied to individuals or an individual's set of objectives and goals. This allows for more shared responsibility. This type of process model assumes that there will be turnover — and as turnover takes place there will be changes in goals, objectives, and funding priorities. If we develop the concept of shared responsibility for instituting the partnership process, this gets us away from reliance on a strong individual. At the current time, partnerships rest very heavily on the charisma and ability of individuals who founded them. By having more shared responsibility, including the ability to change both people and goals, we then make it easier for a partnership to sustain itself past the point in time when there is 100 percent turnover in the players who initiated the partnership.

We must remember that administrators want to put resources into their programs, not programs somebody else developed, conceptualized or started. If the partnership becomes a process and allows the administrator to identify programs and goals that he or she can commit to, then that administrator is more likely to maintain the relationship and support those goals. People want their programs to succeed; they are not always supportive of other people's programs. For partnerships to survive the turnover that is bound to occur given the demographics in education, the process itself must be so successful that everybody wants a piece of the action and everybody wants to be a part of the process. If the partnership process is flexible, then people will be able to achieve their goals within the partnership framework and will not be forced to seek other mechanisms and other administrative structures that will simply reinvent the wheel.

We have managed to develop a climate of trust among many participants in partnership activities. There is also a need for us to be more careful with our interpersonal relationships which theoretically are more fragile. If one of the major players drops out or if anything is done to destroy that current fragile partnership base then we will be back to when public schools and colleges of education failed to communicate — and both set about seeking and supporting different agendas.

It is clear that this social experiment warrants a continuing commitment to address difficult educational concerns which have been with school and universities for a long time. It is also clear that in order to bring about the simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators, schools and universities must change together. Although it will not be a smooth journey, each set of growing pains offers the opportunity for new growth in this collaborative effort.

Juvenna M Chang is Executive Director, Hawai'i School/University Partnership.

John P Dolly is Dean, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

New Partnerships for the Education of Educators

Richard W Clark

Zhixin Su recently completed an examination of teacher education reform proposals made during the past hundred years.[1] She observed that they generally recommend that teacher education feature four characteristics: (1) the best possible general education, (2) an academic major — except that it is not clear what a prospective elementary teacher should study, (3) as few education courses as possible, and (4) a program which emphasizes mentoring arrangements. These traditional panaceas for the education of educators have been repeated decade after decade by advocates who seemingly are unaware that their ideas are not new nor cognizant of the way these same proposals have contributed to the system about which they are complaining.

In the following discussion, I will describe briefly some of the problems with these reform proposals, including with that description a broad picture of typical current programs. Then, by way of contrast, I will describe an evolving school/university partnership-based program and conclude by offering some generalizations for consideration by those who are concerned with improving the quality of education for educators.

General Education

Teachers (and all other members of society) need a sound general education. However, one would have to be oblivious of the world to be unaware of the stinging criticism of American general education efforts in high school and undergraduate institutions (Boyer has done a good job of taking on both institutions during the '80s).[2,3] The question here isn't whether a good general education is needed — but how it tends to be provided. Generally speaking, high school students and undergraduate freshmen and sophomores obtain their doses of "culture" in a series of unrelated courses. Young college students often take their medicine from low-ranking instructors who talk to them in large lecture halls to create efficiencies that allow universities to support the more important activities of research and graduate studies.

Of more direct concern for would-be educators, undergraduates are rarely, if ever, helped to understand the vital connections between what they are learning and the professional career they envision. That is, for example, in the process of gaining an understanding of history, students seldom consider how one learns about history nor are they apt to see educational institutions, leaders, or ideas as part of that history. With reductionist logic, such matters are left to professional foundation courses, if they are given any attention at all. Also, the typical structure of general education programs conveys the message to aspiring educators that a general education is something which is achieved by the time one has completed the sophomore year and thus to be put behind for more serious and rewarding endeavors during the rest of one's life. Given an easily defended notion that a teacher must be a life-long learner, a person whose thirst for knowledge is never satisfied, this compartmentalizing of general education is particularly disabling.

Academic Major

The second solution has been to insist on an academic major. Academicians and lay "experts" alike stress the subject matter major as the means of assuring that prospective teachers really know what they will be teaching! Again ignored are the critical examinations of undergraduate education which raise strong challenges about the efficacy of current programs. In the rush to legitimate the educator's preparation — to make it tough — little attention is paid to whether the major is a series of unrelated credits reflecting premature specialization in a narrow alley of broad disciplines. While an English teacher clearly must be well-informed about the study of English, a person completing an English major may be simply an expert in English literature with little under-

standing of rhetoric, linguistics, speaking, listening, American or world literature — which he or she will likely be expected to help students learn. As was the case in their general education courses, students will not have examined how one learns about matters in their major field. Kerr has written in various ways about this problem. She notes that teachers are required to "understand subject disciplines as modes of interpretation" so they can help students learn to inquire into the discipline.[4] By way of example, she suggests that

> . . . when teachers on the lowest level of schooling are introducing their students to elementary Newtonian physics, it is unacceptable to merely report "the facts" about the physical world, such as bigger children need to sit closer to the center of the plank if they want to teeter-totter with smaller children. Rather, the teacher is responsible for presenting physics as a way of inquiring that has generated such beliefs and that those beliefs are held for particular kinds of reasons.[5]

If the academic majors and general education prospective educators obtain fail to develop these kinds of knowledge and thinking abilities, teachers will fall short of meeting the needs of their students. Thus, the first concern about the offering of an academic major as a "solution" to improving teacher education is that the major may well not have the ingredients needed by the prospective teacher who must "know" the discipline in some unique ways in order to help others learn it.

A second, related observation about the academic major as a cure for what ails educator preparation is that such requirements already exist. Goodlad has pointed out that California, for example, has had such a requirement for secondary teachers for over 70 years.[6] The long existence of this requirement and the continuing concern about lack of scholarly competence seem to suggest that it is not enough to merely require an academic major without giving attention to the particular needs of prospective teachers completing such a major. Moreover, the general disdain of academic departments for the task of preparing teachers and "educationists" will have to be overcome if either the general education or specialized subject matter study by prospective educators is going to be improved. [If anyone doubts the existence of this 'disdain,' talk with faculty in an academic discipline about the importance they are apt to place on the knowledge a prospective new colleague has about preparing public school teachers within their field when they are engaged in searching for an addition to their faculty.]

Education Courses: Limiting Their Number

A good general education and a well-designed academic major should be helpful to prospective teachers. There are serious concerns about whether they exist in the kind and quality which will be most helpful. Given similar concerns about the nature of "education" courses, the traditional reformers have called not for more of them (as is the case with general education) or for improvement of them — but for severely limiting the number of them. Instead of asking whether students come from college understanding the moral imperatives of their profession, how to assist students in learning or any other professional quality, reformers relate anecdotes of "mickey mouse" methods classes and limit the number of hours of professional courses students need or can take in order to be teachers. On the one hand, it needs to be recognized that, as was the case with academic majors, such limitations have been common for many years in many states. Still, teachers' problems in the classroom continue to be related to the understandings they have of their roles, their skills in carrying out the art and science of helping all students learn, and their ability to reflect productively about their own practices — not just in their knowledge of subject matter. On the other hand, the persistence of criticism about professional coursework seems to dictate the need for radical changes in current approaches. Often such courses are taught by the university staff at the bottom of the pecking order. [Interestingly, there is reason to believe that education faculty often have disdain for professional studies similar to that of their arts and science colleagues. If there is doubt of this, check the number of senior education faculty teaching such courses.] Some education courses are taught using methods that make a mockery of the methods they advocate being used (lectures about cooperative learning, for example). Often they are taught in isolation from knowledge of conditions in schools that make them seem particularly irrelevant to new and old teachers alike. The classroom teacher may be faced with students from many cultures, speaking many languages, and approaching schooling with widely different expectations — yet the college classroom may persist in dealing with learning strategies without attention to the interaction of such factors.

Mentors and Mentoring

For years, reformers have seen the answer to the weaknesses of professional courses as being that of assigning

the prospective educator to more time under an expert mentor. Again, relying on anecdotal evidence from new teachers who say the biggest help to them in becoming teachers was their student teaching experience, longer such experiences are advocated. As a matter of fact, there is substantial reason to believe that mentors and prior experiences by teachers as students in schools do have a profound effect in preserving the status quo in schools. Certainly, the teachers of the current decade tend to do pretty much what teachers have done for the entire century — if one is to believe reports such as those by Goodlad,[7] Sizer,[8] and Boyer.[9] Some have suggested that if professional study in medicine were as unreflective and conserving of tradition as the preparation of educators, we would still be bleeding patients to reduce fever and penicillin would be rediscovered every ten years by reactionaries who would be discredited as "experimenters" by all except the grateful few who were fortunate enough to survive because they received a shot. In spite of the limitations of current mentoring arrangements, the powerfulness of such experiential learning should be a clue to those looking for reform in professional education. The challenge appears to be to improve this powerful tool.

Overregulation: Victimizing the Program

In addition to the limitations of these four panaceas, current professional education programs are frequently the victims of overregulation. Multiple agencies build standards for certification and program offering that are sometimes contradictory — and other times just foolish! States require advisory boards, then adopt regulations that are so detailed that the advisory groups quickly recognize they are inauthentic. Much of this overregulation appears to come from lack of communication and trust among interested parties.

School districts view themselves as victims rather than responsible parties when concerns are raised about teacher education. But this may not be justified. They make space available for practicum experiences and accept student teachers with little or no knowledge of the preparation such people have received. For example, during a recent year in one medium-sized west coast district, there were student teachers from eight universities in the state and from universities in five other states, some as many as 2,000 miles away. It is unlikely that the universities really know much about the settings in which their students are completing their programs, and it is certain that the district personnel knew little of the experiences the students had prior to their internships. Districts also tend to exert little influence over the designation of mentors, most often leaving it to volunteers.

Since the education of educators, like the education of any professional, needs to be a career-long activity, school districts should be engaged in a comprehensive, ongoing educational effort. Increasingly, large amounts of money are being invested in staff development. Frequently, these efforts take the form of supporting the latest snake-oil salesman who comes to town with a package of tricks. Rarely is it a program which is tied logically to pre-service experiences. Equally rarely is such training built around an assumption that the practicing educator is a professional capable of reflective learning. Thus, like the general education, academic major, and mentoring arrangements, the issue is not whether there is continuing education but whether there is a sound base for that which is offered.

Summary

A common pattern of professional education is one which stresses general education and an academic major — neither of which are well taught in a fashion relevant for teachers. It de-emphasizes professional coursework, and what it does provide is strongly criticized from all directions. It relies heavily on mentoring arrangements that preserve the current practices and are given stepchild treatment by school districts and universities. States overregulate the process and school districts complain about it but contribute to its problems.

Over the years, the problems with both general and professional education have led for calls to remove professional education from the university setting.[10] Hedges makes the case for removing preparation of elementary teachers based on his 30 years of experience and on many of the same arguments offered above. He speaks with anger about "their hostility toward teacher education . . . [and] their skimming of money intended by state legislators for the training of elementary teachers."[11] However, it is unlikely that his recreation of the normal school will solve these problems. On the other hand, Riggs[12] expresses the belief that significant improvements are indeed being made in teacher education in response to major national critiques such as those by the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. Unfortunately, the indicators Riggs chooses, such as higher grade-point averages for teacher candidates and completion of academic majors are not likely to produce the needed improvements in educator quality.

However, a number of places are beginning to make real changes in educating educators, including the University of Hawai'i where the Pre-Service Education of Teachers of Minorities (PEToM) project and a fifth-year project in conjunction with the national Holmes Group are receiving attention by the Hawaii School/University Partnership. This partnership approach in places as diverse as Virginia, Wyoming, Utah, Maine, and Connecticut may eventually help us discover a way out of the repetition of similar solutions which has been characteristic of the twentieth century. I turn my attention next to one such effort — that of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium which involves 14 school districts and the University of Washington.

New Partnerships at Work

Visualize a university classroom with 22 people: public school teachers, principals, and central office administrators; university professors from curriculum, psychology, and administration departments. They have come together to plan a new approach to teacher training. They know that the effort is to be collaborative and that it is to focus on middle-school teachers. To varying degrees, the individuals in the room are aware of the past four years of cooperative efforts between the school districts and the university. What do you think will happen? If you answered by saying the university faculty would pass out large stacks of xeroxed articles — you were right. If you said the middle-school teachers present would tell the university faculty that the faculty didn't understand the real world teachers worked in — you were right. If you said that the central office administrators would express concern about what all of this was going to cost and whether collective bargaining agreements would allow anything to happen — you were also correct.

As a matter of fact, what occurred in that meeting is all too typical of what occurs in meetings involving people from school and university settings. The remarkable thing about this effort is that by the end of the school year the interactions were far from normal.

During 1988-89, participants addressed three fundamental questions:

1 What are the appropriate educational experiences necessary to the development of teacher leaders for middle schools?

2 How may the schools of the 14 districts of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium work in collaboration with the University of Washington and the Washington Education Association to create a Professional Development Center to provide those experiences?

3 How may the knowledge gained from such efforts be organized and disseminated?[13]

Consider the activities which were used to answer these questions. Following the initial meeting, the planners conducted two seminars. The first focused on middle-school curriculum and on school change; the second, around the knowledge bases for teaching. All participants were expected to do a considerable amount of background reading for these sessions. They were followed up with a one and one-half day retreat which focused on the writing of a general vision of the mission of the Professional Development Center they were creating.

The development of specific programs and structures for the Center was the focus of attention for most of the year. University and school people met every other week for a full day from November through May. Some of these meetings were held at a university site; others were held in school district and teacher association offices. During these meetings, task groups worked on planning major components of the Center. School-site groups worked on concerns for their individual school context, job-alike groups allowed teachers, principals, and university faculty to plan together, and the entire group of planners were kept abreast of the various subgroups' work. At midyear, 23 teacher leaders were added to the initial group of planners and expanded meetings were held at the school sites. When these additional teacher leaders were added, a major weekend retreat brought them up to speed with the other planners. During this, and subsequent sessions, these teacher leaders have helped define the skills that they will need most as they work in roles as cooperating teachers and field supervisors, and as leaders in the continuing development of their peers. People from the Washington Education Association, the University, and the teacher leaders themselves served as trainers for the various sections involving this group of people. A new culture was being created by the people who would work in it.

As the year moved along, teacher leaders helped to attract students to the pre-service program, the plans for which were emerging. An initial class of 14 students was enrolled.

While this routine was moving forward for the basic planning group, a number of additional groups

required attention. Side meetings were held with officials from the local education associations, with the official advisory group to the University's teacher education program, with key faculty members within the College of Education who were not already involved in the project, and with state department officials. From all these conversations, the common view of the Center as a place characterized by people engaged in critical enquiry began to emerge. Common understandings of the shared responsibilities of school district and university people developed. Fears of regulations were overcome. One-on-one meetings between project leaders and superintendents and deans led to a commitment of continuing dollars for the program. Discussions with other sites around the country engaged in similar efforts helped keep the project in perspective.

Following this series of very intensive efforts, the expanded planning group met again in the spring of 1989. Visualize this follow-up meeting. Now it is taking place in one of the school districts. Each of the four schools is represented by a principal and six or seven teacher leaders. Eight professors, three graduate students, several central office and union representatives are present. A visiting lecturer from Oxford University is providing part of the information. Teachers are asking why they don't have access to even more written articles rather than complaining about the ones being passed to them. The principal indicates that information on action research being shared with the group really has the teachers excited. The university faculty comments that it is important for teacher leaders to be referred to as faculty associates, not teacher associates, so that their identity with the university can clearly be established. A district central office official indicates that he is budgeting a free period for three teachers and $20,000 for supplies, stipends, and release time, in addition to other money being provided for the Center in his school district. The meeting represents a truly remarkable evolution from the beginning of the effort the previous fall.

More was accomplished during this year's work than the development of effective working relationships. A new program for the education of teachers was forged which will feature the involvement of teacher leaders from the school sites in the seminars provided the interns. It will include an emphasis on continuing as well as pre-service education, with both centered around exemplary middle-school sites. Reflective practice by professionals will be the norm in the school centers where the preservice and continuing instruction will take place. School districts and university will share in the governance and funding of the educational efforts. Not all concerns about general education and learning about academic disciplines have been overcome, but the communication channels needed to make these changes have been opened.

As noted previously, similar changes are beginning to take place in other partnerships of schools and universities around the United States. Changes are occurring in not only how teachers but also how principals are prepared. While typical principal preparation programs often involve part-time attendance at classes while the student continues major teaching responsibilities, new programs are evolving that concentrate on fulltime participation in professional education. The typical program, if it includes an internship, includes one in addition to regular job responsibilities, and includes assignments such as that of monitoring the bus area, attending athletic events, and checking-in textbooks. New programs are emerging involving fulltime internships with substantially broader responsibilities. While coursework is frequently taught by adjunct professors whose knowledge base is largely that of practical experience and who have a 50 to 60 hour-a-week job in addition to their professorial responsibilities, new programs are emerging with different shared responsibilities between the field and the university. While typical programs seldom help the prospective principals develop thorough knowledge of curriculum and the foundations, new programs are emerging with broader bases in these areas. Cooperative development of programs in locations such as Brigham Young University and the University of Washington (both of which were recognized in 1988 by the American Association of School Administrators as exemplary preparation programs) have made such changes and have shifted from a major focus on coursework to a combination of seminars and intensive field experiences. New attention is given to the selection and role of mentors in working with prospective principals. The cohort of carefully chosen interns typically work at several locations and at several levels, frequently for several school districts, during their year-long experience.

Some Generalizations

From these emerging new partnerships in the education of educators, several generalizations appear possible.

School districts must assume broader responsibility in the education of educators. They must make pre-service and in-service a true priority. This may require them to contribute significantly in salary for the services of people engaged in the pre-service and in-service training of

teachers. The top leadership must express a commitment to pre-service and in-service training much beyond that typically present. Districts must take a major role in the selection of participants: the teacher leaders who will be working with prospective teachers, the mentors for principals, and the interns who are to be engaged in the professional training. Districts must create model sites. It is impossible to train the teachers of the future in the schools of the past. Yet, this persists because of the districts' willingness to place university students wherever it is most convenient — rather than in locations where the best training can occur. Districts must help professional education overcome bureaucratic and legislative impediments, such as specific training requirements which are developed by those too far removed from the field. Finally, districts, as part of their role in the new partnership, must enter collaboratively into demands for higher quality. They can no longer afford to give equal attention in the hiring process to candidates who come from unsatisfactory or marginal training programs and those who come from programs that are responsive to the current needs of professional education.

Universities must also make changes.

- **They must change the status of professional studies.** No longer can universities continue to treat the regular faculty engaged in teacher and pupil education and the clinical staff as second-class citizens in comparison with those engaged in more "scholarly" pursuits.
- **They must assure a foundation for pre-service candidates which does not now exist.** That foundation will require a broader general education more specifically tuned to the needs of teachers and an increased understanding of the purposes and moral imperatives of education in our society.
- **They must engage in an equal partnership with the school districts.** In the process of carrying out that partnership, however, they must not give in on essential issues. For example, they must be certain that they are placing their professional students only where they can be sure that good learning opportunities can be justified. Certainly our colleges of medicine would not place intern surgeons in a barbershop, yet at times our colleges of education know little about the places where they are putting their professional students.

In order to make the new partnership for professional education work, both the university and school districts must exert considerable effort to better understand each other's culture. In spite of repeated admonishments concerning this, substantial lack of understanding exists in both places. Finally, both institutions need to model the kind of behaviors that they want. Professional preparation of principals and teachers must use the kind of teaching methods and demonstrate the kind of leadership which is expected of the candidates when their programs are complete.

These new behaviors from school districts and universities are urgently needed. Fortunately, there are some signs that the new partnerships necessary to meet these urgent needs are beginning to emerge.

FOOTNOTES

1 Su, Zhixin. *Teacher Education Reform in the United States, 1890-1986*, Occasional Paper Number 3, 1986, Seattle : Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington.

2 Boyer, Ernest L. *High School*, New York : Harper and Row, 1983.

3 Boyer, Ernest L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, New York : Harper and Row, 1987.

4 Kerr, Donna. "Authority and responsibility in public schooling" in John I Goodlad, ed, *The Ecology of School Renewal*, 86th Yearbook, Part 1, Chicago : National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1987, 34-35.

5 *Ibid*, 35.

6 Goodlad, John I. "Studying the education of educators: values-driven inquiry" in *Phi Delta Kappan*, *70*, 104-111, October 1988.

7 Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School*, New York : McGraw-Hill, 1984.

8 Sizer, Theodore R. *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*, Boston : Houghton-Mifflin, 1984.

9 Boyer, *op cit*, see Footnote 2.

10 Haberman, Martin. "Twenty-three reasons universities can't educate teachers" in *Journal of Teacher Education*, Summer 1971.

11 Hedges, William D. "We must remove elementary teacher training from the state universities" in *Phi Delta Kappan*, *70*, 623-625, April 1989.

12 Riggs, Robert O. "Our nation's new teachers: how has their preparation changed?" in *ERS Spectrum*, *7*, 2, Spring 1989.

13 McDaniel, Janet and Nathalie Gehrke. "Toward teacher leadership: planning a multi-site professional development center," Seattle : Puget Sound Educational Consortium, University of Washington, June 30, 1989.

Richard W Clark is Superintendent, Bellevue Public Schools, Bellevue, Washington.

Collaboration and Inquiry: Guiding Principles of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal

Carol Wilson

How do we spend our time in classrooms as public school teachers and professors in teacher education programs? How do we know what our students are learning and/or not learning? What school and classroom practices do we engage in, perhaps unknowingly, that inhibit access to and receipt of learning for all students? How often do we create environments that promote thoughtfulness, reflection, and self assessment? Questions such as these arise as we in the schools and higher education institutions of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal join forces to inquire into the circumstances of our schools and teacher education programs.

Implicit in the paragraph above are two guiding principles of the school/university partnership concept that are also salient characteristics of the Colorado Partnership. First is the vital role of critical inquiry in reshaping our schools and teacher education programs. We believe that there is great power in developing the norm of educators asking questions together. This norm of questioning leads to the examination of beliefs and assumptions, the expansion of knowledge and understanding, and the development of new practices.[1] This is the essence of renewal.

Enmeshed in the process of critical inquiry is school and university collaboration, the second principle of the partnership concept. This basic principle, as does the partnership concept itself, grows out of the work of John Goodlad[2] who reminds us that if schools are to change, then those who are to teach in those schools must be educated in ways that are consistent with the desired changes — and vice versa. Additionally, those in schools and higher education must work as equal partners for the mutual benefit of both. In working toward this aim, we focus on the development of vibrant, renewing schools as places in which a significant part of teacher education will take place.

Although difficult to separate, for purposes of elaborating Partnership aims and activities, I shall describe the two principles separately. Before doing so, some background on the evolution and current structure of the Partnership may prove helpful.

When the Partnership was organized in the fall of 1986, its primary activity was the formation of work groups that comprised teachers, administrators, higher education faculty, and community members. Work-group topics included curriculum and instruction, at-risk students, and professional development. These groups met monthly to discuss current literature and to relate the implications of the readings and discussion to their situations and settings. This activity provided a means for developing relationships across schools, districts, and higher education institutions, and broadening and deepening of understandings and insights of participants about issues in the respective areas. It did not by itself, however, result in significant change in schools or in teacher education programs.

In light of the need to move forward, work-group participants again acknowledged that revitalizing schools and programs depends upon the actions of those most directly involved. While they represented a part of the school or program, they realized that they had to be joined by their colleagues in the school setting in order for significant change to occur. Additionally, considering the wisdom of John Dewey who said that "the sources of a science of teacher education reside in the problems of the school,"[3] work-group participants felt that Partnership work should begin to focus on specific schools. The work of the schools should therefore also benefit teacher education. As a result, a number of schools decided to become involved in particular lines of inquiry that would lead to the kinds of change that their settings needed. Teachers and administrators in a number of these schools also expressed interest in working closely with teacher education programs; this meant that their schools would eventually become partner schools, a concept described later in this article.

Additionally, work-group participants believed that these groups could become the networking mechanisms for others in the Partnership to gain access to the ideas and learnings of the schools that were involved in renewal. The work groups would continue to meet on a regular basis, thus allowing those in the work groups to participate, even if their schools were not involved in collaborative inquiry. Additionally, new participants would have a forum for pursuing their interests and developing new relationships within the Partnership.

CRITICAL INQUIRY: EXAMPLES FROM A PARTNERSHIP

Areas of inquiry which schools are addressing include alternative assessment of student progress, how we think about and teach certain curricular areas, changing demographics, student use of information, and equal access to learning. These areas provide points of departure for continual questioning and examining school and classroom practices. Creating and trying out new practices follows, leading to new areas of inquiry.

Alternative Ways of Assessing Student Progress

How we assess what students are learning continues to be a central issue in schooling, largely because in many of our schools and districts assessment means testing, and testing drives curriculum. In a time of specialization and compartmentalization, assessment has become separate from the aims and purposes of instruction. Our belief is that assessment techniques should grow out of and be inseparable from the purposes and substance of what we teach. By examining what we are trying to accomplish with students, we can then begin to think about how to assess not only what students are learning, but also what kind of learning opportunities we as teachers are creating.[4]

We are examining how students can develop the capability to assess themselves so they will become "self-regulated learners." Additionally, we are exploring how parents can learn to ask appropriate questions so they will become partners in the educational process. This last point has numerous benefits. Parents can gain a much better perspective about what students are actually doing in school, thereby increasing understanding and lowering suspicion. Second, consistent understanding and expectations both at school and at home communicate to students that their learning holds value across settings. Third, using assessment as a means, communication among teachers, students, and parents can be enhanced.

The assessment group includes teachers, principals, central office personnel, university graduate students and faculty. Meetings focus on articulating the purposes of our instruction, examining the assessment techniques we now use, exploring other possibilities, trying out the possibilities, and reconvening to discuss what we learn.

As a way to network and stimulate discussion among the educational community, the curriculum and instruction group meets regularly and welcomes anyone in the Partnership who wishes to participate. Another approach to expanding the dialogue has been through symposia and conferences. One such symposia featured Ken Sirotnik from the Center for Education Renewal and local educators who are providing leadership in the area of developing curricular and instructional alternatives, and accompanying assessment processes.

Curriculum: A Vehicle for Reshaping Schooling

Discussions about changing schools and teacher education programs usually revolve around doing the same things — only better.[5] Treatment of curriculum in such discussions often amounts to reorganizing the "stuff" of the curricular area, or perhaps even making it interdisciplinary. Seldom does it mean rethinking the essence of the subject area, examining what we believe about how the subject interrelates with how students learn, or most importantly, how all students might learn.

Project TIME (Teachers Improving Mathematics Education) is providing the Partnership a vehicle for rethinking the nature of mathematics, exploring our beliefs about fundamental issues such as what it means to learn, and giving renewed consideration to what intelligence is. Further, it promotes the practice of teachers working together to inquire and learn for the benefit of all students. While the focus is on mathematics, other subject areas come under scrutiny as teachers and others explore issues that underlie all learning.

This project promotes the idea that teachers need time and support for making important changes. Although change must occur from within the schools, teachers also need to interact with and have ongoing access to resource people in other schools and higher education in order to challenge and expand their perspectives.[6]

The Project TIME group includes elementary, middle and high schools, as well as central office and higher education participants. The Colorado Partnership is linked with the Greater Tucson School/University Partnership, the Puget Sound Educational Consortium,

and the Project TIME creators at the University of California, Santa Barbara. This connection beyond our immediate Partnership lends encouragement and enrichment to our local efforts.

Our work group for the ideas emerging from Project TIME is a group called Math and Beyond. The "chief warrior" for the group is a middle-school mathematics teacher who is assisted in her efforts by a community member and an assistant principal from another school.

Changing Demographics

The thoughtful use of information plays a key role in inquiry. Often, however, we have information all around us without recognizing its presence, much less its value in helping us understand and meet the needs of students. Recognizing and wishing to address the changing demographics of its community, one group of schools decided to delve further into student perceptions about how students experience school. With assistance from higher education, we developed the following set of interview questions for students:

- What is the best part of what goes on in the classroom(s) with your teachers?
- What is the one thing you would like to improve or change?
- What do you spend most of your time doing in your classroom(s)?
- Which students in your classroom get the most attention?
- What is your understanding of what your subjects are? What is math? What is science? Etc.

At the time of this writing, we have completed the first round of interviews. Additional students, parents, and teachers will be interviewed. Teachers and administrators will analyze the differences in responses and use insights they gain as a springboard for revisiting how they address student needs in the classroom. Clearly, responses in the first round have been intriguing and should provoke lively discussion when presented to the schools' faculties.

A Response to How Students View and Use Information

Arising from interests of teachers and higher education faculty is a developmental proposal that revolves around the idea of information literacy. Students need to know how to work productively with the overwhelming amount of information that is available. They need to know how to gain access to information, how to critique, and how to use it. Using technology as a means toward these ends, we will endeavor to engage students in long-term, multidisciplinary projects that they will develop in collaboration with teams of their teachers. The proposal is one example of how we can draw on immediate issues to begin to rethink how we organize our work with students. Once again, the project is not an end in itself, but a catalyst for encouraging teachers and others to examine critically many of the practices that have become unquestionably accepted in our schools.

Equal Access to Learning

A surprising number of practices and organizational patterns commonly used in schools and classrooms perpetuate the barriers that inhibit, and sometimes prevent, learning for many students. Several members of the Partnership have developed a proposal for higher education and schools to examine whether school and classroom practices promote or inhibit equal educational opportunity for all students. The project's aim will be accomplished in two ways: (1) each participating school will engage in examining its practices in light of issues of equity, and (2) teams from five schools will meet in monthly seminars to discuss work going on in each of the schools. Areas for discussion and study include grouping students, amount and types of work required of students, attendance and discipline procedures, and others.

The purpose of this project is to increase awareness of what equal educational opportunity means in terms of the regularities of schooling, with a view toward reshaping practices that impede students in acquiring access to equal educational opportunities.

A Caution!

All of the examples cited above contain the risk of becoming ends in themselves, rather than ways in which adults in a school and in higher education can continue to question, grow, and change, while keeping in mind that the ultimate benefactors are students. A dilemma in many of the partnerships is how to overcome the typical process/substance dichotomy.[7] The examples above are attempts by those of us in the Colorado Partnership to

engage in substantive process in our schools and teacher education programs.

PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS: THE DESIGN IN COLORADO

In a chapter entitled "The Teacher in John Dewey's Works," Maxine Greene notes that "participation and collaboration [provide] the ground for an ongoing creation of identity."[8]

The evolution of the partner-school concept in Colorado aptly illustrates Greene's statement. As those of us in the Partnership schools and higher education institutions learn more about how to work together, we also see more possibilities. The nexus where many of these possibilities come together is partner schools.

The concept of partner schools, also referred to as key schools, is common across the 14 partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal. The way that partner schools develop varies with each setting.

In Colorado we are beginning at the point of existing overlap between schools and teacher education programs; that is, the field experience of prospective teachers. As we progress, we will examine other aspects of teacher preparation. Working with renewing schools that are engaged in the kind of inquiry described above, we aim to do the following:

1. Place groups of practicum students and student teachers with groups of teachers in a renewing school, thereby capitalizing on peer relationships in both groups for encouraging reflection and discussion among and across groups.
2. Create for these students opportunities for a variety of experiences in other partner schools (across levels, districts, and communities), while maintaining a base in one school throughout the practicum and student teaching.
3. Focus the work of teacher educators with pre-service teachers and also inquiry with faculty in the school to encourage and support the norms that make the school a vibrant and vital place.
4. Develop ways for teachers, teacher educators, and prospective teachers to discuss as a group the merits and minuses found in existing school practices and teacher preparation.
5. Examine teacher education programs in light of questions pertaining to quality and sequence of experiences for prospective teachers, and other appropriate issues.
6. Develop ways to respond to what we learn from the five previous points.

WHAT WE ARE LEARNING

The endeavors described above have provided myriad opportunities for us to learn, not only about the subjects of our inquiry, but also about working together in new ways and across differing cultures. Milan Kundera, author of *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, considered entitling his book *The Planet of Inexperience*. His reasoning resided in the fact that in life we are continually entering into realms of inexperience. We are born into this world not knowing what it means to be an infant; and enter childhood, adolescence and adulthood not having previously experienced these stages.

Our inexperience is evident in these ventures into inquiry and collaboration. Delving into our own school and classroom practices with a view toward understanding them in new ways is unusual. Even more unusual and difficult is to consider abandoning comfortable patterns in order to try out alternatives that emerge from new understandings. Few public school educators approach professional growth in this manner. More common is the experience of attending an in-service session to receive training in a particular technique without ever seriously questioning or understanding why or how the technique is desirable.[9] Typically, we overlook the questioning phase and move directly to the solution. The solution may not apply to our particular circumstance, or it may build on fallacious assumptions. A consequence of such "solution seeking" is that we become accustomed to having someone else figure out the answer, having someone else think for us. Questioning, probing or exploring is messy and uncertain. As educators we have been reluctant to engage in messiness and uncertainty, a circumstance which gains importance when we consider the analogue of teacher in the classrooom with students. Telling is the most common classroom practice.[10] Encouraging students to ask fundamental questions, questions to which we may not have an answer, is not. Considered in this light, engaging in inquiry may have yet another benefit. If we are willing to do it, perhaps we would be more willing to structure our schols and classrooms so that students can actively inquire.

The experience of inquiring together helps us begin to see how the norms that we have created to serve us can also hold us captive. It feels safer to retreat into certainties than to journey into uncharted territory. One learning is that when we do launch into critical inquiry as colleagues — public school and higher education — we can expect struggle, individually and collectively. Part of the struggle is to resist easy answers.

An important aspect of this phenomenon of wanting to be provided an answer is recognizing that we do not readily claim our responsibility to question. Involvement, participation, collaboration, and learning do not happen to us. The work of the Partnership advances when designated leaders in the Partnership and in the individual institutions promote the values of inquiry and collaboration for both the Partnership and the institution, and educators in the institutions have the inclination and mechanism for joining the quest. Neither is sufficient by itself.

One final learning is that it takes time to build a foundation, to develop relationships, to share meanings, to forge new norms in order to push forward with observable change. Many educators, school and higher education officials, want immediate results. If we push for certain results too soon, we may unwittingly foil our progress. Developing our abilities to appreciate and nurture the subtleties of significant change may prove more productive in the long term.

In the process of learning about collaborating and inquiring, we are learning that internal dilemmas and issues will continue to arise. As we persist in addressing the problems, we need to look to the larger context of the community; local, business, state and others. The climate in Colorado, as in many states, is characterized by concern and heightened dialogue about education in our broader community. The result is that myriad groups and organizations are becoming involved in some way in public education. Inviting others to participate in our efforts and joining in the public discussion are crucial extensions of the mission of the Partnership. Our self-examination must not be construed as self-absorption. We must be willing to raise questions, such as: What is our context, and how does it affect what we are doing or trying to do? How do we create opportunities that promote thoughtfulness, reflection, and continued dialogue across the essential groups? Continuing to question and push forward will help us create further opportunities to capitalize on our inexperience and thereby create alternatives we do not yet know.

Membership in the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal includes: Boulder Valley Public Schools; Cherry Creek School District; Denver Public Schools; Englewood Public Schools; Metropolitan State College; School District 12, Adams County; the University of Colorado at Boulder, and the University of Colorado at Denver.

FOOTNOTES

1 Sirotnik, Kenneth. "Evaluation in the ecology of schooling: the process of school renewal" in *The Ecology of School Renewal*, Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

2 Goodlad, John I. "School-university partnerships: rationale and concepts" in *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases and Concerns*, Kenneth Sirotnik and John Goodlad, eds, New York : Teachers College Press, 1988.

3 Dewey, John. *The Sources of a Science of Teacher Education*, New York : Liveright, 1929.

4 Hiebert, Elfrieda. "Beyond Wobegon: Increasing the Role of Teacher-Based Assessment," *forthcoming*.

5 Wilson, Carol; Richard Clark and Paul Heckman. "Breaking new ground: reflections on school-university partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal," *Occasional Paper No. 8*, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1989.

6 Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School*, New York : McGraw-Hill, 1984.

7 Wilson, Clark and Heckman, *op cit*. See Footnote 5.

8 Greene, Maxine. "The teacher in John Dewey's work" in *From Socrates to Software: The Teacher as Text and the Text as Teacher*, Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

9 Heckman, Paul and Carol Wilson. "On professionalism in teaching" in *Education Week*, Commentary, February 24, 1988.

10 Goodlad, *op cit*. See Footnote 6.

Carol Wilson is Executive Director, Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal, and is also one of three Regional Coordinators, National Network for Educational Renewal. She earned her PhD from the University of Colorado at Boulder, and holds a BA in English and an MA in social foundations of education. Dr Wilson has been a teacher, assistant principal, high school principal, assistant superintendent and university instructor.

"Restructuring" vs "School Improvement"

Paul E Heckman

Current efforts to restructure schools reflect an implicit tension between fundamental restructuring and the more traditional concept of "school improvement."[1] This paper focuses on the failure of many participants in restructuring efforts to make a genuine and crucial distinction between these ideas.

A major restructuring effort, such as that taking place within the Greater Tucson School-University Partnership, focuses both on schooling practices and on the preparation of teachers and administrators. Teachers, principals, superintendents, and other school personnel are brought together with university faculty to examine fundamental issues, ideas, and underlying assumptions of both institutions. Basic to the success of such an endeavor is the willingness to accept new ideas, to allow for heretofore unimagined possibilities.

In the sections that follow, it will be argued that participants in partnership activities do not distinguish restructuring from improvement. Operating in an "improvement" context, these participants are not achieving the substantial change that is called for if schools and universities are to meet the challenges we face.

The Problem

In the Greater Tucson School-University Partnership, individuals from all levels of seven school districts meet in a variety of support groups with University of Arizona faculty. Many members have reported finding these meetings stimulating, supportive, and beneficial. At the same time, few schools and none of the programs in the College of Education have been restructured in dramatic ways, even though aspects of certain member schools and of the teacher and administrator preparation programs in the College of Education at the University of Arizona have been modified.

In light of the five years of partnership activities, the rate and level of progress are disappointingly slow. One might look for explanations to traditional "variables" such as resources, leadership, clarity of goals and expectations, appropriateness of timelines, and/or adequacy of design or organizational strategies. It will be argued here that the most significant underlying factor is the continuing tendency to mistake restructuring for "improving."

As noted above, "school improvement" efforts do not require the acceptance of new ideas. For example, "improvements" of grouping practices have centered in some cases on refining the identification of gifted learners who have high verbal ability. These students are given additional opportunities to develop this ability away from other students who are less verbal in school contexts. "Improvement" frequently focuses on a single aspect of a college of education or school that needs alteration. For instance, if refinements are made in the identification of gifted students, only the process of identifying students receives attention and not the larger context in which this occurs. Finally, few questions are asked about the importance of any piece of a program or school under examination because it is assumed that all the existing parts of a school are essential. For example, courses are presumed to be the way to organize secondary school and teacher and administrator preparation programs.

Also, boards of education, superintendents, teachers, and principals consider questions about the way things are now, not how they should be. They have experience in responding to improvement questions and determining ways to make schools "better," but seem to lack either the time, inclination, or experience to cope with significantly new ideas about the structure of schooling.

Program improvement — as home improvement — share a common foundation. New paint, carpets, window trimmings, and furniture make up most home improvement efforts. Home remodeling on the other hand involves structural changes: Doors and windows are moved, walls are taken out or built, new rooms are added. In effect, the house is different in function as well

as appearance. Thus, restructuring schools and university preparation programs is like remodeling a house. Existing programs will require fundamental change such that new programs are unlike the old ones in substantial ways.

Goodlad has stated that the National Network for Educational Renewal exists to promote within school-university partnerships the simultaneous renewal of schools and preparation programs.[2] Implied in this purpose is the belief that as K-12 education is restructured, new university preparation programs will prepare prospective teachers and administrators for tomorrow's schools. This simultaneous restructuring allows the novice to be socialized and enculturated with the new ideas, practices and structures of the school and preparation program.[3]

Propositions

What follows then is a proposed list of propositions that exemplify the interconnectedness of restructuring of schools and preparation programs in a context of genuine commitment to renewal.

Significant restructuring of school and preparation programs will require fresh ideas for major rebuilding of many parts of the system. Our knowledge about learning, intelligence, and many other related fields has changed dramatically. Furthermore, the conditions of children and society are different from those conditions of even just ten years ago. These fresh ideas and new knowledge, when considered and accepted by the adults in the school, can serve as a basis for reconstructed schooling practices.

The New Knowledge

Available information about the nature of intelligence, learning, child growth and development, and the subject fields has undergone significant change and suggests alterations in the nature and organization of the school, curriculum, and ways of assessing student learning.

- The creation of intelligent capacities is a function of the experiences that children and others have. The assumption is that all children can be smart in many ways when they have powerful enough experiences to promote their intelligent capacities.
- Learners learn as a result of the kind of work that they engage in school.[4] The job of teachers is to create together good work for learners. The nature of that work should reflect the kind of real work that students will find in the real world.[5] For example, problem finding appears to be a critical aspect of real world problem solving. In addition, real problem finding/solving occurs in social contexts with others.
- Children do not develop in nine-month chunks except during gestation. They develop in larger chunks of several years — three to four in general.
- When schooling is responsive to the existing conceptions and schemata of children, children do not face discontinuity and do not have to be ready for school. Schools are prepared for all children.
- Children construct their own schemata for seeing the world as a consequence of their experiences and the social interaction among the children about these experiences. Since each person has different experiences, the nature of their schemata will differ while sharing some common characteristics.
- The task is to move away from applying knowledge to real-world settings to inventing knowledge about and understanding a real world.[6]
- The subject fields provide ways to comprehend and represent the real world so that citizens can function more effectively in economic, political, personal, and social arenas in a democratic society.

Knowledge about organizational practices, leadership, structures, and planning also poses new organizational arrangements for the adults and children of a school.

- Leadership focuses on shared value commitments of all members of the organization, commitments which are instantiated in the organization.[7]
- Norms of information richness, collegiality, and experimentation are important characteristics for a healthy organization.[8]
- Current planning strategies accept the unpredictability of a messy world and, therefore, relies upon everyone to take action on a lot of common information.[9]
- Smaller groupings of teachers and others who gather information, understand the context, make decisions on their shared understandings, and enact together invented practices and structures for students to be workers promote a healthy school organization.

Educational ecologies exist within every community. They consist of the formal (schools), nonformal (Boy Scouts, and others), and informal (families) educational opportunities available to all children in a community. These ecologies have changed, and in many cases, deteriorated. Creating new connections and continuities among restructured schools, child-care institutions, and community agencies hold promise for rebuilding the educational ecologies of changing communities.

- Children spend more of their lives developing schemata in the nonformal and informal than in the formal aspects of the ecology.
- The encouragement of personal, social, and intellectual development are espoused goals of education in all fifty of the United States. Educative experiences in all parts of the ecology should be facilitated in the context of these goals.[10]
- Connected learning experiences which build on the existing schemata of children should be invented and experienced by children in all parts of the ecology.
- Increasing communication about invented practices and the ideas on which the practices were based among the parts of the ecology promotes continuity of experiences for children across the ecology.

The propositions noted above are incomplete for fully restructuring public schools and preparation programs. Others could and should be generated. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this paper, the propositions suggest the kinds of knowledge that could be the basis of restructured educative activities and organizations in educational ecologies. In addition, the propositions can serve as a basis of questions about the nature of restructured schooling, its connections to other educational institutions in the community, and the nature of restructured preparation programs for educators.

QUESTIONS

The questions are grouped into categories regarding the adult work life, the organizational arrangements, the curriculum and instruction of the school, and the nature of teacher and administration preparation programs.

Adult Work Life

- What organizational arrangements will encourage teachers and others to discuss together the way schooling is now done, find together significant problems about these conditions, and use fresh knowledge about learning? How will these discoveries and inventions lead to new practices and structures whereby the alternatives are tried out and evaluated? How well do the alternatives address the identified problems?
- What workplace groupings can be created so that teachers are not isolated from one another and can share responsibility for the nature of the student work and development throughout the unit and school?
- What structures for exchanging information about the conditions, problems, and solutions across the different units of the school can be invented?
- How can school leadership be developed in ways that everyone functions appropriately as leaders and embraces a set of shared values for guiding the activities of the smaller units of the school?
- How can teachers — and others at the school — be encouraged to use strategy planning ideas in which details are not yet specified and where important ideas and values guide action that is taken frequently and with a lot of reflection?

Organizational Arrangements of the School

- What inter- and intraclass groupings can be arranged to bring together heterogeneous and multi-age groups of students with a team of teachers who will remain responsible for the students for a three- to four-year period? In what variety of ways can this promote students' social, personal, intellectual, and vocational development?
- Can teachers and students connect to a day-care activity that begins before and ends after school and to the families of the children who attend the school?
- What structures and activities will promote common ideas for use in developing continuous experiences across the units of the school?
- How is information and knowledge gathered about the nature of the educative experiences of children in the other institutions of the ecology?
- What structures and activities need to be created so that all of the institutions in the ecology commit to a common set of values and ideas for guiding the activities and experiences of all children? Who does this and how is it done?

Curriculum and Instructional Activities

- What curricular experiences will best reflect the nature of real-world problem finding/solving?

- How can students be encouraged to be the workers for learning and teachers the designers of work for students?
- In what ways can teachers and students gather information about existing conceptions of the problems under examination in the school experiences?
- How can students be encouraged to find problems about phenomena that are close to them and their neighborhoods, collect relevant information about the conditions of the phenomena, examine the information in order to find significant problems, and represent the nature of the problem and possible solutions to reflect the ways of thinking of one and/or several subject field areas?
- What public exhibitions and performances will enable students to portray the ways that they think like a scientist, historian, artist, etc., in finding and solving significant problems about their community and the larger society to their parents, community members, and peers?

Teacher and Administrator Preparation

- How can preparation experiences be organized so that novices acquire the major understandings of learning and schooling congruent with the kinds of restructured schools suggested at by the questions above?
- In what ways can faculty from a college of education, teachers and administrators from a school, and novices preparing to become teachers collaborate to understand the conditions of schooling, to find problems and to invent together practices based on new knowledge about learning and schooling?

So What?

The questions point to the many aspects of an educational system that will require restructuring. Since the parts are interconnected, the questions must also be seen that way. Consideration of any one question will necessitate addressing others. All of them will affect together all parts of the school, the educational ecology, and preparation programs.

How teachers and others acquire the understandings and enact changes suggested by the propositions and questions, and the theoretical basis and practical implications for responding to that kind of questioning are subjects for another paper. In general, new understandings arise as teachers examine together their beliefs about existing practices in light of the knowledge implied in the propositions identified earlier. Certain old and new practices and ideas will be more easily analyzed and accepted than others. It is necessary to experiment with new understandings in small ways while maintaining attention to the multiple aspects that will eventually have to change together.

The partnership is primarily a network and can provide crucial support. Networks encourage, they do not do the restructuring work. Support and encouragement for restructuring may take many forms. For example, when groups of the partnership meet, reminders can be made about the difference between improvement and restructuring; powerful ideas can be brought to the attention of teachers, principals, and others so that distinctions between what is known and what could be known are made; questions about the conditions of practice can be promoted, and teachers can be encouraged to try out and share new practices with colleagues from other schools and the university.

A partnership can provide opportunities for all of its members to think and act together about important ideas and new practices. In this context, traditional gulfs between theory and practice and between thought and action can be bridged.

Finally, groups will need to meet over a long enough span of time for members to know, trust, think, and act together in ways suggested by the propositions and ideas of this paper. In general, support groups are temporary systems that reduce anxiety and encourage members to try out ideas and practices, feel secure about them, and gain familiarity with "pushing against their personal and group boundaries." They can return to their school sites and enact small experiments without having to change everything at once. Small successes of this type can lead to more substantial actions by more people about more aspects.

Conclusions

If partnerships direct their efforts to improvement, they may go out of business because improvement needs no larger context than the individual. Districts and colleges can make improvements more easily, more efficiently, and less expensively without the partnership because the synergistic sharing of ideas plays no significant role. Support for improvement is already adequate. Few have to be encouraged to make things "better" for themselves and children.

On the other hand, partnerships are an important vehicle for supporting restructuring. Support for restructuring is not evident in most districts and colleges even

when the superintendent or dean espouses it. A partnership will have to espouse restructuring forcefully, convinced that "improvement" is not sufficient to address the conditions and the related problems of schooling and preparation programs of today.

If partnerships can promote a context of restructuring, a powerful force for altering schools and preparation programs in substantial ways will have been unleashed. Furthermore, the network can then encourage the renewal implied by the goals of the National Network for Educational Renewal for each member partnership.

FOOTNOTES

1 Shanker, Albert. "The end of the traditional model of schooling and a proposal for using incentives to restructure our public schools" in *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*, 5, 345-357, January 1990.

2 Goodlad, John I. *What Schools Are For*, Bloomington, Indiana : Phi Delta Kappa Foundation, 1979.

3 Heckman, Paul. "On the corruption of teacher education by psychology" in *Teacher Education Quarterly, 11*, 1-13.

4 Doyle, Walter. "Classroom knowledge as a foundation for teaching" in *Teachers College Record, 91*, 3, 347-360, Spring 1990.

5 Andersen, Richard and Bonnie Armbruster. "Some maxims for learning and instruction" in *Teachers College Record, 91*, 3, 396-408, Spring 1990.

6 Brown, John Seely; Allan Collins and Paul Dugrud. "Debating the situation: a rejoinder to Pelinscar and Wineberg" in *Educational Researcher, 18*, 4, 10-12, May 1989.

7 Bennis, Warren and Bert Nanus. *Leaders*, New York : Harper & Row, 1985.

8 Waterman, Robert. *The Renewal Factor*, New York : Bantam Books, 1987, 6.

9 *Ibid*, 31-32.

10 Goodlad, John. "Linking schools and universities: symbiotic partnerships," *Occasional Paper No. 1*, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1987.

Exploring what it means to think mathematically, Project TIME (Teachers Improving Mathematics Education) Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal. Photo courtesy of Carol Wilson

Paul E Heckman is Executive Director, Greater Tucson School-University Partnership, College of Education, University of Arizona.

Beyond Compliance: The Obligations of Leadership

Richard Andrews

A remarkable thing happens every year in this country: a new crop of 18-year-old children is born. Observations of these newborn children in the hospital nursery reveal how much these newborns look remarkably alike. They look so much alike, it is difficult to tell which are White, Black, native American, Asian or Hispanic. We cannot tell which are rich or poor, which were born to single parent teenage mothers, and those born into two-parent households. Without close inspection, we cannot even tell the boys from the girls. Indeed, they look so much alike the hospital puts labels on them lest their parents could not tell which child was theirs. One has only to note the celebrated cases where the names of two children were switched and their parents could not tell that the child they took home from the hospital belonged to someone else.

Five to six years later these children enter our schooling system. We measure their level of cognition and find considerable differences in their performances based upon their ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and/or family type. Those children who were born into families that provided them with rich cognitive environments perform at higher levels of cognition than do their counterparts who were born into families who have less resources, less stability, and/or have different cultural norms than those expected at school. The evidence is legend that after 13 years of treatment by our schooling system these initial differences are greater than they were when the children entered the schooling system. Contrary to our high ideals that our schooling system should give all children equal access to knowledge and equal access to the benefits of our society, our schooling system does nothing more than the British system of education — it gives birthright societal privilege. Our schooling system engrains patterns of cognition already present in these subpopulations of children.

For nearly three decades, we have tried to explain why children do not succeed in school by studying the characteristics of the children — or the methods that teachers use to teach — or structures beyond the school. There is a growing body of evidence that indicates that we have looked in all the wrong places. Instead of the failure being inherent in the children — or the methods teachers use to teach — or structures (federal rules, state rules, district control, or not enough resources) beyond the school, the failure is the product of the expectations for schools and the structure of relationships among teachers and the principal within the school.

The expectations for schools and the structure of relationships between teachers and principal are not independent of each other. Expectations for schools create the structure of relationships in schools. Therefore, changing the structure of relationships within schools is dependent upon first changing the expectations for schools. Over the past three decades, we have expected our schools to comply with rules, structures, procedures, and community norms rather than expecting them to produce specific measurable student outcomes. Thus, we have operated and evaluated our schools on a compliance model rather than on a student outcome model.

We have chosen to inspect, accredit, and reward schools on the extent to which they comply with standardized curricular and instructional materials, course and subject format, time allocated to subjects, hours per day, days per year, and easily identifiable procedures for determining whether or not special dollars have been spent on children with identified needs (Chapter I, remediation, at-risk, special education, gifted, etc). Contrary to popular rhetoric, the average school in this country is not an overregulated organization. The average school in this country is an island unto itself, free to do, day in and day out, whatever the principal and teachers decide to do, and held accountable for absolutely nothing in terms of student outcomes. The average school is adrift in a sea of uncertainty, unsure of where to go and unsure of how to get there. School people are assured that they are doing alright if they are in compliance with predetermined rules and regulations.

In the average school, the curriculum and instructional processes are decentralized to the classroom teacher. The culture of the school is one in which the classroom of the teacher is a private sanctuary where the teacher can do whatever he or she pleases. School principals spend their time busying themselves with managerial tasks rather than instructional matters. Principals and teachers pretend that teaching is easy, and it can be done in isolation of other teachers. To ask for assistance or to consult with others is a sign of weakness — not a professional obligation.[1]

How many of us would go to a physican who practiced in such a manner? How many of us would allow a surgeon to operate on us who said, "I can do this job all by myself. I do not need the anesthesiologist, the radiologist, the support system, I can do this job alone." Yet, we will allow a teacher who espouses and operates in such an isolated and self-reliant manner to go into the classroom and close the door and do surgical procedures on the minds of children. Clearly, these conditions have not served the needs of children who desperately deserve good schools.

As educators we have been comfortable having our performance judged on the basis of compliance. Compliance is relatively easy. If we are to create the kinds of schools that will give all new crops of 18-year-olds equal access to society's benefits, we must transform our thinking to have our performance based on the **outcomes** that we expect from our schools and the **processes** that we desire to have in place. Under the compliance model, the evidence is overwhelming that bad schools get rewarded and good schools get punished. If the teachers and the principal of a school practice in such a way that their children do not need remediation, their children do not get referred to special education and they lose resources to run their school. But, on the other hand, if teachers and principal operate in such a way that they produce greater and greater numbers of students who need remediation and special education, they get rewarded. Their school gets more money and additional staff to operate the school. How does this make any sense at all? It does not! We must fundamentally change what we have been doing.

We must clearly and precisely define both the outcomes that we desire from our schools and the processes we expect to be in place if we are to serve the children desperately in need of good schools. Our research, as well as that of others,[2-4] clearly suggests that under the compliance system of education we have enormous differences in the quality of teaching and learning in schools. However, using compliance as our measure, good schools and bad schools look alike. Each can comply equally well. However, when considered on the basis of outcomes, the differences in quality become quite evident.

Why are the expectations that we have for schools so important to us now? Our expectations for schools are important not only because all children deserve good schools, but also because of the rapid rise in children who have not historically succeeded in a compliance model of schooling. The Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools at Johns Hopkins University estimates that the number of children under the age of 18 will increase by 17 percent between now and the year 2020. The percentage of Hispanic children will increase from 9.3 percent of the nation's 0- to 17-year-olds to over 25 percent of this age group. The population of black youth is expected to increase by 22 percent; the number of white youth to decline by 13 percent.

The number of poor children is expected to rise 37 percent; children living with one parent, 30 percent; children living with mothers who have not finished high school, 56 percent, and children whose primary language is not English, 7.5 percent.[5]

New schoolwide and districtwide approaches will be necessary if we are to serve the interests of these children and provide them with the skills and knowledge necessary to function effectively in an increasingly technological world. The formula is simple, we must change from a prevailing attitude that performance equals compliance to the prevailing attitude that:

Performance = Processes + Expected Outcomes

To implement such a change requires that we turn upside down what we do now. We have centralized curriculum and instruction design and decentralized outcomes and accountability. Currently most states and districts design instructional delivery systems and school processes and hold schools accountable to the degree that they comply with these procedures. To date, only five states in the nation accredit schools based on student outcomes, and the sixth state, Wyoming, is developing such a process and expectation.

In the new model, districts or states must clearly and precisely specify the outcomes and the organizational processes that are expected of schools: leadership of the principal, learning climate, high expectations, frequent monitoring of student progress. These variables must be measured at least annually, and schools must be held accountable for delivery. At the same time, we must centralize the school's curriculum and instructional delivery system from an isolated classroom model to an integrated school model.

It is not my intent here to add to the list of outcome expectations for schools, but to specify the parameters under which the model should operate. There are

excellent examples of outcome expectation in the country. Two are worth mentioning here: At the state level, a new set of expectations for high schools has been developed by the New York State Vocational Education Department; at the district level, a comprehensive set of criterion referenced outcomes for grades and subjects have been developed by the Campbell County School District in Gillette, Wyoming. Whatever expected outcomes are chosen, if all children are to benefit the outcomes must meet the test of excellence and quality. By excellence, I mean nothing more than that all children will master the outcomes we expect and will achieve at their true and natural level. By equity, I simply mean that initial entry-level difference between children of color and white children, poor children and affluent children, and single-parent household children and dual-parent household children will be eliminated as these children progress through the schooling system.

What implications does such a change in perspective have for the leadership of schools? In an outcome-based performance model, leadership becomes much more important; it is dynamic, change-oriented, and performance is based in the power of processes rather than the authority of office. In a compliance-based model, leadership is benign, status quo oriented, and performed through the authority of roles and office. Clearly, such a transformation will increase uncertainty and cause agonizing doubts among many parts of the educational establishment. Conditions of uncertainty and doubt demand new forms of leadership. As noted by Bennis and Nanus, "Nothing serves an organization better — specially during times of agonizing doubts and uncertainties — than leadership that knows what it wants, communicates those intentions, positions itself correctly and empowers its work force."[6]

In his earlier work, Bennis[7] reminded us that there are four competencies of leaders: management of meaning, management of attention, management of trust, and management of self. As noted in our earlier work[8,9] "management of meaning" indicates that the school principal must have a clear understanding of the purpose for schools. Management of the symbols of the school toward fulfilling that purpose becomes the primary theme, then, about which all activity must be organized. "Management of attention" simply means that the educational leader has the ability to get the teachers to focus and expend their energies toward fulfilling the purpose of schools. In the main, this means that teachers will use their talents to teach children. "Management of trust" simply means that the school principal can behave in such a way that others believe in the principal to the extent that style of leadership is not an issue. "Management of self" means nothing more than I know who I am; I know my strengths and weaknesses, and I play to my strengths and shore up my weaknesses.

Conceptualized in this way, then, there is a strategy for successful leadership that must accompany an outcome-based performance model. Leadership is successful only if it empowers the organization. Empowerment is an often used word today and tends to mean that something (curriculum matters, activities, processes) has been delegated to someone else or that I have involved others in decision making. These notions seem to serve at the heart of much of what has been written on building- or site-based management or teacher leadership. If we use what we have learned from 50 years of research on leadership within organizations, we arrive at different conclusions:

- Leadership can be shared or expanded but not delegated;
- The larger the organization the greater are the needs for diverse forms of leadership.

Empowerment, then, is not involvement — but an organizational state. Organizations (schools) are empowered when the majority of people buy into a dream and then get the results that they desire. Enpowerment, then, has ethical and moral implications circumscribed by what we expect from schools.

Surely, the results that we desire from our schools is to live up to what we espouse — schools should give all children equality of opportunity to enjoy the benefits of our society. Clearly, then, our dream must be to provide greater access to the benefits of society for youth based on birthright. Those who, by accident of birth, were born into white, middle-class families should not have greater access to those benefits simply by who they got as parents. We must restructure our relationships in schools such that we educate children from all families.

We must build a sense of empowerment of our schools that is based on the challenges that Kalman Hettleman, special advisor to Baltimore's school board president, Robert Embry, and to school superintendent Alice Pinderhughes put forth when he asked, "What would happen if we decided to ensure that every child in every school would reach the third grade on time and with adequate skills — no matter what? What would happen if we decided that no child would be assigned to special education for a learning problem unless he or she were seriously handicapped? What would happen if we decided that no child should need to be retained in-grade

or relegated to long-term remedial services? How could we design an urban elementary school that would simply refuse to accept the idea that even a single child will fail."[10]

There is a powerful body of research that suggests that the key to achieving such expectations requires that we must have school leaders who can empower the school. To empower a school, the leader's behavior must have the four key components illustrated in Figure 1 as drawn from Smith and Andrews[11] and Bennis and Nanus.[12]

As presented in Figure 1, **vision** is nothing more than being able to see a future desired state. The school principal must be able to see what this school must do to serve all children. Vision is not enough, however, as it has little value as long as it stays only with the school principal. The school principal must be able to **communicate** that vision clearly and forcefully to others in the school, or the vision will not be realized. To have a vision — and to be able to communicate that vision — requires that the principal be able to take the actions necessary to make the vision happen. **Positioning** means just that. The principal can diagnose and assess each situation and display the behavior needed to get things done. This means that there is no one best — or all-encompassing — style of leadership. But, rather, the situation dictates leadership needs. Last, but certainly not least, is **self-management**. The school principal cannot empower the school by simply saying, "Read my lips." Teachers will only hear what the principal is *saying* by what the principal *does*. The principal must behave in such a way that he or she promotes the best in self and others. The principal clearly must believe and behave in a manner that communicates that "the kids are first!"

The challenge before us is monumental. These are harsh and demanding times in education. Harsh and demanding times need leaders who will use strategies for taking charge. Taking charge does not mean picking up a bullhorn and brandishing a baseball bat. Taking charge means the principal does so with a sense of vision and commitment to have a school serve all children and increase the capacity of the school to perform through curriculum and instructional processes.

Richard Andrews is Dean, College of Education, University of Wyoming.

FIGURE 1

STRATEGY FOR SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP

Empowerment results from
VISION
"I see a desirable future state"
plus
COMMUNICATION
"I can convey that future state clearly and forcefully"
plus
POSITIONING
"I can take the action to make the vision happen"
plus
SELF-MANAGEMENT
"I can behave in ways that promote the best efforts of self and others"

FOOTNOTES

1 Powell, A G; E Farrar and D K Colon. *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace*, Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1985.

2 Andrews, R L; R Soder and D Jacoby. "Principal roles, other in-school variables and academic achievement of ethnicity and SES," *Paper* presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, April 1986.

3 Andrews, R L and R Soder. "Principal leadership and student achievement" in *Educational Leadership*, 44, 9-11, March 1987.

4 Mortimer, Peter. *School Matters*, Berkeley, California : University of California at Berkeley Press, 1989.

5 For a more detailed analysis, see Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, *The changing nature of the disadvantaged population: current dimensions and future trends*, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 29pp, 1989.

6 Bennis, Warren and Bert Nanus. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*, New York : Harper and Row, 1985.

7 Bennis, Warren. "The 4 competencies of leadership" in *Training and Development Journal*, 38, 8, 15-19.

8 Andrews and Soder, *op cit.* See Footnote 3.

9 Smith, Wilma and R Andrews. *Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference*, Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD Press, October 1989.

10 Madden, N A; R E Salvin, N L Karwett and B J Ziverson. "Restructuring the urban elementary school" in *Educational Leadership*, February 1989, 14-18.

11 Smith and Andrews, *op cit.* See Footnote 9.

12 Bennis and Nanus, *op cit.* See Footnote 6.

Partners in Learning and Leading

Nancy Austin and Lynne Miller

We are two people who have long straddled the worlds of the university and the schools. Though we now have faculty positions at the University of Southern Maine, we have taught in both elementary and secondary schools and continue to work in schools and with school people as part of our faculty load. Our participation in the Southern Maine Partnership has reinforced our beliefs that a university and its neighboring public schools are capable of inventing effective ways to work together and can, with effort, forge a true collaboration. In the pages that follow, we tell the story of our school-university partnership, and examine how one of our working groups developed its own agenda for meaningful action and, in the process, promoted new forms of leadership and a new notion of school-university collaboration.

The Southern Maine Partnership

The Southern Maine Partnership is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), a national consortium of school-university partnerships, each representing "a virtually untried and, therefore, unstudied phenomenon"[1] and sharing a commitment to Goodlad's dual agenda of the renewal of schools and the renewal of the education of educators. As Goodlad has noted:

> The argument for school-university partnerships proceeds somewhat as follows. For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators),universities must have access to schools using the best practices. To have the best practices, schools need access to new ideas and knowledge. This means that universities have a stake in school improvement just as schools have a stake in the education of teachers.[2]

In its efforts to meet its dual agenda, the Southern Maine Partnership has developed a structure that mimics neither the hierarchical and bureaucratic structure of the schools nor the organization of the university, where individual achievement is rewarded over collaboration and where theory and research are valued over practice. Rather than having a centralized and elite governing board with respectability for decision making, the Partnership depends on various collaborative work groups to develop their own agendas and to chart their own paths. The only constraint on the groups is that they focus on some aspect of school and teacher renewal. Each group is composed of school people (administrators and teachers) and at least one university faculty member who serves as the group's convenor/facilitator.

During the 1989-90 academic year, there were ten established and one emerging partnership work groups involving over 200 teachers and administrators, 14 full-time university faculty, and the dean of the College of Education. The groups include the following:

- **Superintendents' Group.** Composed of 15 superintendents, this group investigates issues related to curriculum and instruction, especially literacy and numeracy development.
- **Administrative Leadership Group.** Open to all principals and central office administrators, this group explores school/community relations and the shifting roles and responsibilities of schools.
- **Secondary Group.** High school principals and teachers attend this group in school teams and discuss and act on issues related to restructuring and alternatives to tracking.
- **Middle School Group.** Administrative/teacher teams meet to solve problems that emerge from the implementation of the middle school concept.
- **Elementary Group.** Our largest group, composed of over 40 educators, discusses issues of evaluation and experiments with alternatives to standardized tests, such as observations and portfolios.

- **Mathematics Group.** Composed of K-12 mathematics educators, this group explores mathematics learning and develops a wide range of classroom teaching strategies.
- **Literacy Group.** Designed for K-8 teachers, this group focuses on whole language instruction and on process writing approaches.
- **Counselor Group.** Open to all counselors in participating districts, this group develops strategies to deal with new state mandates about guidance education.
- **Teacher Development Group.** Teacher educators from both the schools and the university meet to discuss new configurations for pre-service education and to provide feedback to the pre-service planning team.
- **Adolescent Study/Life Stories Group.** Secondary teachers and university faculty collect and analyze adolescent life stories as a way to understand student issues and concerns.
- **Foxfire Group.** In the process of becoming, this group will be composed of teams from 11 districts who are preparing to learn about and implement Foxfire approaches.

Though the groups have wide ranging agendas and formats, they share a commitment to generating and reading research, to reflective practice, to experimentation and risktaking, to colleagueship and collaboration, and to active engagement in school reform. We think that the best way to explain just how the partnership works is to highlight one group, focusing on its emerging self-definition and continuing development.

Partnership in Action: The Mathematics Group

The Partnership Mathematics Group was the first partnership group to transcend grade levels, since its members teach K-12, and to concentrate on a specific content area. Formed in 1985, the group assumed new direction in 1987 when a newly hired University of Southern Maine mathematics educator joined the group as university facilitator. This new direction has as its centerpiece shared experiences in mathematics learning and dialogue. This dual focus on experience and talk had its beginnings in a dinner conversation among mathematics group members and Liz Fennema, a visiting lecturer from the University of Wisconsin. Fennema's work concentrates on gender differences in mathematics. She noted that since small group discussions provide an effective forum for reluctant talkers, girls and others reluctant to engage in large group discussion could well be served by small cooperative learning groups. As the conversation continued, the need to provide common experiences as a basis for dialogue became clear to members of the group. When the group met later to plan the agenda for subsequent meetings, members agreed to a new format for their monthly sessions: a shared mathematics experience where teachers could explore mathematics learning together and time for dialogue and reflection of the experience and its implication for classroom teaching and learning. This combination of shared experience and reflective dialogue proved to be not only an effective format for the group but a powerful approach to mathematics teaching as well.

The group soon discovered that mathematics could be learned through working with others, that dialoging in small and large groups was a rich source of learning, and that trying out those ideas shared in a meeting with students in classrooms provided group members with the vehicle for greater dialogue about mathematical learning. Through these activities, teachers became researchers and reflective practitioners. The university facilitator's work with children in district classrooms established her as a participating member of the group. Across grade levels, teachers shared their experience and insights. An egalitarian ethic developed. High school teachers gained from the experiences of second-grade teachers. Learning together, getting new ideas for classroom teaching, and trying out those ideas became the stuff of dialogue. The common mathematical experience at the monthly meetings helped teachers become more reflective learners. The application of mathematical learnings in their classroom helped them become more reflective teachers.

In the course of its work, the group agreed upon three principles:

1. The centrality of sharing and dialogue to the learning of mathematics,
2. The importance of the learner and his or her construction of meaning, and
3. The validity of teachers' craft knowledge, based on understandings of themselves as teachers and learners.

Project CLIME

The abovementioned principles became the basis of a state-funded grant called Project CLIME. It was through CLIME that the three principles were tested and refined and that another element, that of teacher leadership, became part of the Mathematics Group's agenda.

As a result of CLIME, the math group intensified its efforts and began meeting twice a month. One meeting was designed as a four-hour workshop/discussion session providing concrete mathematical experiences, dialogue and reflection, small group work, and planning for classroom experiences around some mathematical topic. The other meeting took the form of a two-hour dialogue session including reflection on classroom practice and personal learnings, exploration of instructional strategies, and discussions of a wide range of mathematics topics. The four-hour sessions were facilitated by both university and teacher participants. Each session was planned by a group of teachers, one or more of whom served as facilitators at the session. The group looked at the topic, examined areas of possible learning difficulty, and possible activities that would serve a diverse group of teachers. In addition, university facilitators modeled effective teaching strategies focusing on the learner, the use of powerful mathematical tools, and dialogue through demonstration lessons in participants' classrooms.

Each four-hour session usually worked through a topic with an emphasis on the use of powerful mathematical tools. Grade-level groups discussed possible applications and activities that might be tried in classrooms. Feedback from these sessions was important. The group initiated a new feedback strategy, based on Gattegno's[3] work during these sessions. At the end of each session, participants were asked to talk about what they were thinking, what had come to them as a result of the session, or where they were at that particular point. There were no guidelines other than hearing from as many people as were able to share at that time. The role of the facilitators was to just listen. Much was gained from this type of feedback. People felt much freer to talk about their feelings, especially concerns, when they knew that all comments were equally welcome and that all feelings were accepted. The facilitators and all others knew how other participants felt about their experiences that evening. The diversity of responses was instructive. In general, the facilitator felt rewarded by the comments, and had a clear picture of the thoughts of each participant, and where the group could go next. For the participants, the strategy provided an opportunity to reflect out loud on their own learning and to hear others do the same.

CLIME also encouraged teachers to initiate staff development efforts in their own schools and districts. Success in this regard was varied. While some teachers found support in these activities, others encountered difficulties in establishing legitimacy with their peers and their accepting of attitudes about the teaching and learning of mathematics that differed sharply from their own. The members of the math group had become reflective learners and reflective practitioners and some found it difficult to work with others who worked differently and wanted quick answers to their teaching problems. While it was safe to share within the partnership group, teachers found a less secure environment in their schools. The norms of cooperation, dialogue, reflection, and experimentation that had developed over time in the Partnership group were often not present in the school culture. Teachers acknowledged this is a problem and one that required more experience in collaboration and explicit training in leadership to solve.

The new focus on leadership training continued through the regular math group sessions as teachers acted as session planners and facilitators in the spring of 1990. As CLIME's grant funding ended, the math group sought to invent a second arena for its work. A new grant proposal was developed and funded. It began with three, full-day sessions last spring, followed by an intensive three-week summer school program where teachers developed strategies and taught classes to public school students. The intention was to provide the opportunity for teachers to refine their skills of dialogue, reflection, teaching, and leading. Through the project, teachers worked in teams to plan, teach, dialogue, and critique teaching and learning as they worked with children and each other. In this way, the classroom became a teaching and learning laboratory, where curriculum was developed and tested. This classroom-as-laboratory model was a powerful one in another way. It provided teachers with an arena in which to grow as reflective practitioners and group facilitators.

For many members of the math group, leadership means to listen in a way that will enable them to accept the opinions and actions of others. This is an important prerequisite to the facilitation of reflective work. If teachers are to become leaders within their schools, they must provide avenues for dialogue and encourage the expression of conflicting viewpoints. Teachers will be supported in their emerging leadership roles through the establishment of a peer support group and opportunities for graduate study in an instructional leadership program at the university.

Understanding About Learning and Leading

Teachers and university faculty who have been involved in the Partnership Mathematics Group have uncovered some important understandings about learning and leading — and the connections between the two activities.

- Teachers are learners,
- Learning begins with dialogue, talking about something (mathematics) to someone,
- Dialogue is most meaningful when it is focused on a shared experience, something people explore together as learners,
- Each learner makes sense of a common experience in his or her own way, each constructs personal meaning from the experience,
- The meanings learners construct are varied and often conflicting; those meanings become the basis for further dialogue,
- Teachers are leaders in their classroom when they structure the opportunity for their students to share experiences and talk about them; teaching is leading,[4]
- Teachers have a wealth of information and craft knowledge that they can share with each other and learn from each other,
- Teachers are leaders in their schools and in the profession when they provide an arena for their peers to do things together, to talk about them, and to apply them to their classrooms,
- Teachers who lead other teachers need to develop the ability to listen and to accept the position of others, even when they are in conflict with their own.

This last understanding is the most difficult to put into practice. It presents the greatest challenge to us as we pursue our work in becoming partners in learning and leading.

Roscoe Davidson, left, Chair, Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal, discussing the "thoughtful community" with Rex Brown, Education Commission of the States, and Fannye Evans, Denver Public Schools.

Photo courtesy of Carol Wilson

FOOTNOTES

1 Sirotnik, Kenneth and John I Goodlad. *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns*, New York : Teachers College Press, 1988.

2 Goodlad, John. *Reconstructing Schooling and the Education of Educators*, Seattle : University of Washington, 1985.

3 Gattegno, C. *Strategy Taught as Part of a Workshop for Educators*, New York, 1981.

4 Schlechty, P and H W Joslin. "Images of schools" in A Lieberman, ed, *Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft & Concept*, New York : Teachers College Press, 147-163, 1986.

Lynne Miller is Executive Director, Southern Maine Partnership, University of Southern Maine.

Nancy Austin is a Colleague.

Self-Interests in School/Business Partnerships

Byrd L Jones and Robert W Maloy

The quality of life that today's students will enjoy in the 21st century depends on how their education meshes with technological and organizational innovations to improve productivity. Output per worker cannot sustain historical growth based on mass production for a domestic market aimed at immediate corporate profits. Instead, a better educated and continually retrained labor force will have to work together redesigning products for manufacturability and quality. "In the longer run," according to a major study of industrial productivity, "the convergence of market forces, consumer preferences, and technological opportunities suggests the possibility of "totally flexible" production systems in which the craft-era tradition of custom tailoring products to fit the needs and tastes of individual customers will be combined with the power, precision, and economy of modern production technology."[1] Tomorrow's workers and consumers will maximize their welfare by sharing information about what they want beyond their basic needs and cooperating in producing those goods and services in what Shoshana Zuboff has called "a learning community."[2]

Throughout the 1980s, private firms renewed their involvement with public education through formal partnerships. As established institutions, schools are remarkably similar — sharing a distinctive culture marked by teachers facing complex roles in isolation with endemic barriers to change.[3] Two in five schools now engage in formal arrangements with outside groups, and 52 percent of them involved businesses — largely providing such supports as guest speakers, special demonstrations, awards, scholarships, or incentives for students. More than 140,000 collaborations link millions of teachers with workers from private enterprises around common activities and purposes.[4]

Many corporations view partnerships as enlightened self-interest because they want graduates who "contribute to business as workers, consumers, and supporters of a democratic free enterprise system."[5] Currently, businesses spend over $100 billion annually on employee training programs, and corporations seek cost-effective ways to educate workers. By improving public schools, firms transfer some of their training costs to the public — especially for general skills and a readiness to accept responsibility. Productivity growth depends on some thirty million technical, professional and managerial workers, while over thirty million blue-collar jobs increasingly require a high school education to read instructions, monitor equipment, and meet precision standards.[6] Seeking to attract and retain skilled employees, local companies "see their business interests dependent on a vital community with a good school system at its heart."[7]

Despite their popularity, partnerships between schools and businesses may fade away unless people (1) understand their self-interests in a broader social context over a longer time horizon, (2) strengthen their voice for reforms by working together, and (3) adopt realistic objectives. Better curriculum and instruction will yield more productive workers only after years of additional schooling, matched by appropriate strategies and structures for businesses. Firms worry about losing their investment in a school when graduates are hired by their competitors. Outsiders who work with teachers and schools have earned credibility to criticize and propose reforms; but when businesses ignore schools or cancel partnerships because of mutual frustrations, they surrender their influence. Finally, an emphasis on measurable outcomes suits a hierarchical society with assembly lines and bureaucracies rather than flexible and creative organizational structures that respond to individual preferences.

DYNAMICS OF COLLABORATION

Paradoxically, one of the presumed benefits from school/business partnerships is that projects will clarify the self-interests of both students and employers in better schools. Ordinarily, public schools and their outside partners define collaborations as straightforward "you have/we need" exchanges in which organizational resources flow primarily in one direction — from businesses to schools.

Such superficial interchanges seldom deepen understandings of varied organizational and personal realities, especially about the complex and overburdened roles demanded of teachers in public schools. After examining seven projects in detail, we concluded that most "interchanges seldom evolve over time, engage only a few individuals, respond mainly to surface problems, and rarely touch the underlying ethos of participating organizations."[8]

Like schools, private enterprises are marked by characteristic cultures that enhance or confound collaborations. Businesses aim to make money for their owners. When they do so by offering a better product to potential customers at a satisfactory price, they are relatively free to decode how to enjoy their successes. Because firms typically act through a functional hierarchy, executives decide, authorize, and then monitor results. By contrast, public schools — whether they are effective or not — are held to bureaucratic procedures and multiple goals including both educational and political components. Educators face certification requirements, state mandates, restrictive rules, dysfunctional hierarchies, few discretionary funds, complex tasks, and high isolation. Concluding that educators are indecisive, muddled, fearful of strict accountability, business leaders may decline to cooperate.

Near Term Collaboration

Thus outside partners seek specific school improvements which directly benefit their firm or agency in the near term. For instance, the Boston Plan for Excellence in the Public Schools emphasized measurable improvements in student attendance, retention and test scores. The chair of the Private Industry Council expressed reluctance to "endorse the expenditure of another $100 million over the next four years" without more positive evidence.[9] In seeking tangible outcomes, firms focus on secondary schools and often on programs that directly relate to their employment needs — which seems sensible. Vocational and technical programs serve local businesses which hire secondary graduates to use up-to-date equipment. On the other hand, studies in the economics of education indicate that the dollar return is greatest for investments in prenatal care, then early childhood education, followed by elementary schooling.

Partnerships between schools and outside organizations are almost always voluntaristic, adaptive in their development, and inherently untidy in their organizational strategies and structures. These features are real strengths of cooperative projects. Because collaborations are flexible, people and organizations accomplish change without needing to redesign entire systems. Partnership arrangements are well-suited as explorations of future educational possibilities — participants can grapple with uncertainties, ambiguities, and group processes in order to shape personal and social meaning systems. That flexibility, however, makes it difficult to determine whether a specific program yielded an intended result.

If partnerships are in everyone's self-interest, why do public policies and foundations support school/business collaborations through urban compacts, small grants, judicial decisions, lobbying, and publicity? This question introduces a troubling conundrum. Business leaders acknowledge the value of cooperating with schools, but congruence of interests in an informed citizenry and competent labor force dictates neither a particular interorganizational linkage nor specific activities. What is true in general for all schools and all employers — notably a linked future — dictates no actual collaboration between **a school** and **a firm,** each with its own setting, history, cultural constraints, and goals. A consistent examination of self-interest reveals how partnerships may overcome the limitations of short-term, superficial exchanges.

Business Compacts for Capturing "Spillovers"

Despite well-documented positive benefits of collaboration, variations of the spillover effect and the free rider issue infect the processes of working together. In general, external benefits will cause profit-seeking firms to underinvest from a social point of view. A firm working with a school may find benefits from its investment spilling over to its competitors. Thus, addressing long-term educational problems does not necessarily fulfill a company's interest in tangible, immediate payoffs for its contributions. Accordingly, firms commonly offer low-cost extras such as outdated computers and underutilized capacity or focus on high-visibility interventions such as scholarships. Free riders among partners is an organizational analogy to a persistent management problem in schools and firms that depend on knowledge workers. Their performance can neither be supervised visually nor inspected for quality. Professionals, technicians, and managers all benefit from organizational effectiveness but have a self-interest in contributing less than their fair share. They work best when they adopt the organization's goals and culture.

Inducements for collective action depend on the number of group members, distributions of relative size, and their history of previous cooperation.[10] Firms that dominate their immediate locality effectively capture most

benefits simply because they normally hire many graduates, and they find school-based programs less costly than on-the-job training. When school committees are dominated by a nearby firm, a voluntary partnership agreement seems redundant. In some cities such as Boston and Atlanta, leading businesses have long cooperated on community projects, and they mobilize media and peer pressure on other firms to do their part. In the absence of an established leadership group, local educational funds have created organizations to sponsor partnerships. In cities across America, community groups for better schools have redirected their efforts toward encouraging firms to assist an identified school on substantive issues. Compacts and consortia have served as honest brokers to match firms with appropriate schools in terms of needs and resources — as well as interests, locations, and possibly personalities of leaders.

An endemic ambivalence appears in most consortia. On the one hand, their publicity consistently stresses "long-term measurable goals" such as "increasing attendance from 93.8 to 95 percent" and "raising performance on standardized tests by three percentile points annually" in Albuquerque, or "providing 500 fulltime jobs for graduating seniors" in Louisville. On the other hand, rhetoric by school and business leaders calls for "a sense of hope," "real equality of educational opportunity," and "a creative positive energy." In Providence, the superintendent praised the Compact for its exploration of "initiatives resulting in school improvement and community growth."[11] In effect, businesses and schools may defect from those fuzzy, but significant goals in order to emphasize specific objectives. A report on consortia noted that its own evaluators focused too much on products and not enough on "their ability to be quick, nonbureaucratic, flexible, catalytic, and generally discretionary" once trusting relationships had been established.[12]

Partnerships with National Corporations

Because so much funding for schools now comes from states and because recessions have hit first the Rust Belt and then the Sun Belt, a case can be made for consortia that will foster regional partnerships with national corporations taking the lead. The National Alliance of Business regional office in New England is currently considering such an effort. Within the framework of such compacts, schools and businesses may enjoy the benefits of ongoing interactions without having to sustain a particular arrangement. Some partnerships achieve their specific goals while others generate unhealthy frustrations. Consortia has a self-interest in promoting longer-term change efforts that affect the deeper structure and culture of schools through ongoing commitments. When several firms engage in collaborative efforts to improve schools, everyone may find a sense of gain as the benefits of collaboration spill over to communites and regions. With the burden on any one partner reduced, a changed payoff system encourages support for creative and flexible interactions that break with traditional school patterns.

Loyalty and Voice Through Partnerships

Sustained interactions with outside organizations compensate for another weakness of purely market-oriented approaches to inducing change in failing organizations. Albert O Hirschman examined "exit" and "voice" as responses by consumers, workers and organizations who find themselves dissatisfied with existing services, products or conditions. "Some customers stop buying the firm's products or some members leave the organization: this is the exit option." But leaving schools — either children or companies — does not repond to the negative spillovers from unenthusiastic and unprepared workers. In a sense, failure-expectant students who leave school prior to graduation are like a polluted stream: A school system might have reduced its budget by discouraging troublesome students, but the costs will be borne by others who are downstream. Alternatively, those individuals or organizational members may "express their dissatisfaction directly to management or to some other authority to which management is subordinate or through general protest addressed to anyone who cares to listen: this is the voice option." Hirschman urged greater emphasis on voice and less on exit as a response to declining organizations.[13]

Hirschman's analysis is particularly relevant to how firms may respond to requests by public schools for assistance. Companies may decline to participate. In an extreme case, a firm may leave a community with inadequate schools. Exit and the threat of exit are ineffective forms of voice in educational reform because businesses have to live with the consequences of what public schools do. As Hirschman noted, "full exit is impossible." Instead, firms must establish some visible sign of loyalty before others hear their point of view about school change. "As a rule, then, loyalty holds exit at bay and activates voice." Only after a firm has worked with a school and shared its realities will their loyalty be sufficiently established to promote discussions about desirable educational outcomes.[14] Educators and business leaders normally

engage in lengthy trust-building processes before communicating their shortcomings and hopes. Mutual responsiveness encourages voice.

Individuals engaged in improvement activities have difficulty identifying their vulnerabilities, uncertainties, insecurities, and fears. When modest payoffs with minimal risks characterize the outset of cooperation, then partners can learn to work together. Gradually, trust and vocabularies become shared and planning succeeding rounds of activities becomes easier. Cooperation often emerges among self-seeking individuals without a central authority or an organizational hierarchy when multiple parties believe they will continue to negotiate together. Whether participants view a cooperative venture as a win-win or a competitive win-lose situation depends on their understanding the possible positions of others, finding mutual payoffs, trusting the good motives of the other partner, and reducing discussions of weaknesses and problems to a manageable level. After a time, cooperation with its reliance on voice becomes the preferred strategy.

An emphasis on organizational commitments and voice, rather than exit (often a refusal to buy or participate), has major resonance for two major issues limiting organizational productivity. First, companies value workers who fit into the corporate culture because they work well with colleagues without extensive directions and explanations. Imagine, for instance, explaining entrepreneurial initiative and responsibilities to a new worker accustomed to docility and close supervision in a classroom. Second, teachers are professionals who must rely on their knowledge and shared values to make literally dozens of decisions about instructional means and goals every hour. Partnerships offer occasions for dialogue between business personnel and educators that reveal professional and organizational assumptions. Those new interactions establish norms for communication and experimentation.

In designing a positive program for "a more productive America," a Massachusetts Institute of Technology Commission found that successful firms transported workers' roles from "passive performance of narrow, repetitive tasks to one of active collaboration in the organization and fine-tuning of production." Competencies and innnovations were continually refined on the job. "Restructuring job categories, flattening hierarchies, broadening responsibilities, and taking on new tasks in regular job rotations — all of these produce a workforce capable of responsing rapidly and creatively to new problems."[15] Meanwhile, the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession recommended restructuring to acknowledge complex roles and teacher judgments about educational processes. Freed from bureaucratic procedures and trusted to make decisions about staffing and instructional methods with enough resources to implement an educational program, "professional teachers can concentrate on inspiring, coaching, guiding, and motivating students, and applying other resources, including technology, to the task of improving student learning."[16]

Both schools and business organizations exhibit patterns of group interaction that sustain the status quo. Top leaders often encourage change in their groups and welcome voices conveying different perspectives in order to stimulate creative thinking. Most useful communication between insiders and outsiders raises questions ordinarily left unaddressed within one's own group. Those conversations reveal alternative ways of framing one's purposes and approaches, thereby promoting reforms in schools and society. Unless teachers feel themselves engaged in thinking about future societies in cooperation with outsiders, they can scarcely convey those linkages to their students.

Documenting Collaborative Successes

Business partners have typically sought evaluations that will demonstrate that everyone "got their money's worth." Hard data are to provide an equivalent to a firm's bottom line of profit or loss so that more effective and/or efficient programs will displace others. Yet an emphasis on clear results measured by well-established tests may discourage significant innovations and other, perhaps more appropriate, goals for future settings. Too often accountability encourages projects that skim the easier cases in order to show positive gains — meanwhile discouraging complex goals, voluntary participation, and serendipitous achievements. Assessments may avoid defensiveness or self-congratulation, if the questions connect to factors within the collaborative project's control.

Pressures for accountability for specific objectives may contradict the strength of school-business partnerships — their voluntary interactions among persons from different organizational cultures. They encourage simultaneous teaching and learning with multiple purposes and exploratory activities. A traditional approach of setting goals, establishing tasks, and evaluating outcomes may capture only a small part of the dynamics of partnerships. The preponderance of unanticipated outcomes in most educational endeavors, as Michael Patton noted, "render useless standardized, quantitative measures of program outcomes while indicating that assessment must take place on a case by case, program by program basis."[17]

Collaborations usually flourish around ill-structured problems, and leaders will accordingly find qualitative reports more useful than statistical summaries.

Thosands of educational studies have demonstrated that almost any project that a research is committed to will show some positive results, so that the problem lies in the "compared to what" issue. There are too many variables to control for all of them in a feasible evaluation. While businesses note that their "profits" reflect a relatively greater satisfaction by consumers than obtained from less successful firms so that their demise is no loss to society, neither students nor schools disappear when they do badly. Hence, any improvement in low performing schools may represent a gain without regard to comparisons with other buildings. Nor can anyone know how teachers and students might have interacted under different conditions.

School outcomes depend largely on inputs from students — although their opportunity costs or foregone earnings are seldom included in pricing educational programs. Generally, a low-cost (to public or business partners) and high-output (measured in student attainment) program has successfully motivated learning without requiring equipment, adult supervision, or instructional time. Given America's social structures and their links to schooling, middle-class suburban children in a college preparatory program are least costly to the public — even though districts serving such populations typically have more local resources and fewer competing demands for public services. Urban and rural children living in poverty with a history of school failures and multiple deficits of health and family supports often require more special services and enroll in expensive vocational programs. By age 16 they typically fall $100,000 to $200,000 short of their suburban peers in total investment in their human capital (estimate includes foregone earnings of parents and students); and few voluntary programs have resources to bridge that gap.

Oddly enough, educators and parents who seek equity will also diminish the observable benefits of educational programs. Even if one compared siblings who participated in Headstart with those who did not in order to match factors of inheritance, of incomes, and of family concern, the comparison would predictably understate program gains. Quite simply, caring parents will shift some of their time and support to the child who stays home — or perhaps to their own quality of life. Similarly, a fair teacher eager to help children will take advantage of special programs to work with the other students. Principals and superintendents may likewise act to spread their resources among others. Traditional guidelines for categorical federal programs aimed at low-income children — that resources should supplement and not supplant regular school support — are difficult to enforce even when such shifting perpetuates educational inequities. In the case of altruistic educators it may be neither possible nor desirable to deter partnership benefits from spilling over to affect the school's climate.

Questions and Conclusion

A rich literature on effective schools and on successful innovations suggests that self-interest means paying attention to group processes that foster communication and cooperation.[18] Do partnership activities build common understandings among teachers and others about their goals? Are those standards and norms shared with students, parents, members of the outside community? Are expectations for students both high and realistic with regular monitoring and reporting? Do activities deter free riders in maintaining a climate that is orderly and conducive to learning? When partnership activities support behaviors that contribute to those processes which characterize effective schools, then they are clearly moving in the right direction although few evaluations will show convincing evidence of immediate and statistically significant gains in test results.

These strictures on comparative evaluations should not discourage good documentation of the strategies, activities, processes, structures, and achievements of all participants — including outside partners and teachers as well as students. Nor should recordkeeping focus exclusively on planned outcomes and traditional measures of academic achievements. If a partnership indirectly supports a student jazz group whose performances at assemblies builds spirit and cohesiveness among a racially diverse student body (as happened at English High School in Boston), then why ignore that benefit? Much of the information can be presented in the words of teachers and students whose self-perceptions of education are understandable to outsiders and convey a sense of teaching and learning in today's schools.

Both school people and their business partners should trust their feelings about whether their collaboration is enjoyable, useful and worth continuing. That sense of self-satisfaction in voluntary participation in schools by all — especially students — is a true measure of self-interest and a surprisingly good indicator of effective partnerships. As businesses and other groups share activities and build relationships with schools, they typically combine elements that economic studies relate to future

productivity: longer time horizons, flatter hierarchies, recurring education, flexibility, quality, and technology to custom fit individual needs. Implicit in those partnership activities lies the development of more independently professional roles for all workers in more equitable organizational structures.

FOOTNOTES

1 Dertouzos, Michael; Richard Lester, Robert Solow and the MIT Commission on Industrial Productivity. *Made in America: Regaining the Productivity Edge*, Cambridge : MIT Press, 1981, 131.

2 Zuboff, Shoshana. *In the Age of the Smart Machine*, New York : Basic Books, 1988, 394.

3 Goodlad, John. *A Place Called School*, New York : McGraw-Hill, 1984. Also, Ann Liebermann and Lynne Miller, *Teachers, Their World and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement*, Alexandria, Virginia : Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984; and Seymour Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, 2nd ed, Boston : Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

4 National Center for Education Statistics. *Education Partnerships in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools*, Washington DC : Government Printing Office, 1989.

5 Barton, Paul E. *Partnerships Between Corporations and Schools*, Washington DC : National Commission on Employment Policy, 1983, 60.

6 Ehrenhalt, Samuel D. "Economic scene: work-force shifts in the 80's" in *New York Times*, August 15, 1986, D-2.

7 Wise, Robert I. "Schools, businesses and educational needs: from cooperation to collaboration" in *Education and Urban Society, 14*, 1981, 70.

8 Jones, Byrd and Robert Maloy. *Partnerships for Improving Schools*, Westport, Connecticut : Greenwood Press, 1988, 6.

9 Reported in *Education Week*, November 9, 1988, 5.

10 The reasoning in this paragraph follows Mancur Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action*, Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1965.

11 National Alliance of Business. *The Compact*, Spring 1989, 3, 8 & 11.

12 Public Education Fund. *Five Years*, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania : Public Education Network, 1988, 12-13.

13 Hirschman, Albert O. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1970, 4.

14 *Ibid*, 100, 78. (Italics dropped from text.)

15 Derfouzos, *op cit*, 137. See Footnote 1.

16 Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, New York : Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.

17 Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*, Beverly Hills : Sage Publications, 1980, 70.

18 See Charles M Payne, *Getting What We Ask For: The Ambiguity of Success and Failure in Urban Education*, Westport : Connecticut : Greenwood Press, 1984.

Byrd L Jones is Professor of Education, Staff Development and Urban Education, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. For two decades he has served as Principal Investigator and Academic Coordinator for a variety of partnerships with public schools, community groups, and business collaborators.

Robert W Maloy is Manager, Continuing Education Programs, and Adjunct Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of Massachusetts. He directs a collaborative tutoring project with several local schools and represents the Division of Continuing Education on the area's Private Industry Council.

Jones and Maloy have co-authored *Partnerships for Improving Schools* (Greenwood Press, 1988) which focused on the dynamics of collaborative interactions over time.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA
1907